

THE
National Demand

BY
Lok. TILAK

THE SONS OF INDIA, Ltd.
MADRAS

[4 A2.]

THE NATIONAL DEMAND

The following resolution on Self-Government was passed at the Calcutta Session of the National Congress :

"This Congress expresses grateful satisfaction for the pronouncement made by His Majesty's Secretary of State for India on behalf of the Imperial Government that its object is the establishment of Responsible Government in India. This Congress strongly urges the necessity of the immediate enactment of a Parliamentary Statute providing for the establishment of Responsible Government in India, the full measure to be attained within a time limit, to be fixed in the Statute itself, at an early date. This Congress is emphatically of opinion that the Congress-League Scheme of Reforms ought to be introduced by the Statute as the first step in the process."

In supporting the above, Lok. Tilak delivered a remarkable speech of which the following is the full text :

"I have not the eloquence of my friend Mr. Bannerji, nor of my friend Mr. Jinnah, nor the trumpet voice of Mr. Bepin Chandra Pal. Yet I have to do a duty, and I mean to place before you without any introduction a few facts in support of the resolution which has been so ably moved by the proposer, seconded by the Hon. Mr. Jinnah and certainly not amended but intended to be amended by my friend Mr. Bepin Chandra Pal. The resolution, as you all know, is about Self-Government or Home Rule for India. The first paragraph of it says : 'This Congress expresses grateful satisfaction for the pronouncement made by His Majesty's Secretary of State for India on behalf of the Imperial Government that its object is the establishment of Responsible

'Government in India.' The speaker who preceded me—I mean Mr. Bepin Chandra Pal—seems to think that it is not yet time to be grateful for the declaration of policy. To a certain extent I share in that view, but, at the same time, I cannot say that the wording of the resolution is not adequate. For gratitude, as you know, is defined by one of the best ethical writers of England to mean expectation of favours to come; and grateful satisfaction, translated in view of that definition, means satisfaction at the pronouncement attended with an expectation that the later stages of it will come in course of time as early as possible. That is how I interpret 'grateful satisfaction'. I am satisfied for the present that a thing that was not pronounced before has been declared now, and I hope, at the same time, nay expect, that it will be followed up by higher stages of

development in time to come. All talk about further stages is out of place at present. What should be the first step is the point that I want you to understand. A very simple definition of Home Rule which any of you including a peasant can understand is that I should be in my own country what an Englishman feels to be in England and in the Colonies. The simplest definition is that, and that is the whole of it. All those bombastic phrases, such as 'partnership in the Empire,' 'terms of equality,' etc., mean that I want to be in my country not as outlander but as master in the same sense that an Englishman is a master in his own country and in the Colonies. That is complete Home Rule, and if any one is going to grant it to-morrow, I shall be very glad for its introduction, for it will be Indian Home Rule granted all at once, but I see that it cannot be

done. Some compromise has to be made with those who are not in our favour and with some of our friends. The British power in India was introduced by a compromise, by a Charter. In fact, the first step in a province which you have not conquered is always with consent and compromise, and what the first step should be is explained in this resolution. All talk about future progress, about the establishment of Responsible Government in the Provinces and afterwards in the Central Government is a very good talk with which I fully sympathise but which I am not prepared to demand as the first step of the introduction of Home Rule in India. That is the difference between myself and Mr. Bepin Chandra Pal. He wants the whole hog at once. I say it should be granted to you by stages: demand the first step so that the introduction of the second step would be much more

easy than it is at present. The Government in the pronouncement has used the words "Responsible Government," not Home Rule or Self-Government. Mr. Montagu in the declaration and the Government of India in their Proclamation have deliberately used the words "Responsible Government" unfortunately without defining it, because Responsible Government, as naturally understood, means Executive Government responsible to the legislature. But in one place in Mr. Curtis's pamphlet I find that "responsible Government" is defined to be one where the legislature is subject to the executive. You will see that it is quite necessary to define the words "Responsible Government"; otherwise words may be interpreted quite contrary to our intention and it may be said: 'We promise you Responsible Government but a Government where the legislature ought to be under

the control of the Executive". And the more it is placed under the control of the Executive the more responsible it will become according to this (Laughter.) I must state frankly here that this is not the kind of Responsible Government that we want. We understand by the words "Responsible Government," a Government where the executive is entirely responsible to the Legislature, call it Parliament or by any other name, and that legislature should be wholly elected. That is responsible Government, full responsible Government that we want. When I say that the Executive should be under the control of legislature, I go so far as to say that even Governors and Lieutenant-Governors must be elected by legislative bodies. That, however, will be the final step. But in the present circumstances I shall be quite content, and so I think most of you will be content, if the first step that we

demand is granted to you immediately, and Self-Government at an early date. And by 'early stages' I do not think that any sane man would understand to be anything which would be attained in fifty years, because a period extending to fifty years is not 'early'. Anything that exceeds the time of one generation is not 'early'. 'Early' means certainly in ordinary parlance ten or fifteen years. I should have liked that a definite number of years should have been introduced in this resolution. However, we do not lose much. I say that no sane man can understand 'early date' to mean other than ten or fifteen years. But some men thought that it would be rash to ask for Home Rule or Responsible Government in ten or fifteen years. It was dropped. Never mind. At any rate, the sense is there. I must draw your attention to the pronouncement made.

What is it? It is that full Responsible Government or merely Responsible Government without any qualifications—that means the same thing—Responsible Government without any limiting qualifications will be granted to you in ten or fifteen years. That part of the answer given by Mr. Montagu we note with grateful satisfaction in the sense in which I have just explained it. There are certain other conditions. That pronouncement says that it will be granted to you by stages. We also agree to it. The third part of the declaration is that these stages would be determined by the Government of India. We do not agree to that. We want the stages to be determined by us and not at the sweet-will of the Executive. Nor do we want any compromise about it but insist on definite stages and the time to be fixed in the Act itself so that the whole scheme may work automatically. There we differ

from the wording of the declaration: however it is not said here in so many words but the second paragraph of the resolution demands it: it demands a Parliamentary statute to be immediately passed definitely settling and fixing the time when the goal is to be reached, not leaving it to the Government of India to determine when and at what circumstances and in what stages they will grant full Responsible Government to us: definite time should be named in the statute which will be passed about the subject very soon. So, the second part of the resolution is practically a suggested modification of the declaration about which we have expressed our grateful satisfaction in the first part of the resolution. In the third paragraph of the resolution we stick to what was passed last year at Lucknow both by the Congress and the Muslim League. It has been said that that scheme is objectionable and

that after a year's experience we should have modified it at this Congress. I hold a different view. I am glad that we all hold the same view. (A cry of 'no,' 'no'.) That will be determined when we take the votes. If we unanimously pass the resolution it may be that I shall be speaking for you when you pass the resolution without a dissentient voice. I hold that the Congress-League scheme is the minimum which might be granted to us to satisfy our aspirations at present and to make a decent beginning in the introduction of Home Rule in India. I tell you why. There have been a number of schemes suggested at various places in India by Congress men and non-Congress men, by Muslim League men and non-Muslim League men and by backward and forward classes as they call themselves and by other different communities, and all these representations

have been sent up to the Secretary of State. What do you find if you analyse them? The majority of them say that they approve of the Congress-League scheme but they want something more, and if you take vote, you have all the votes for the Congress-League scheme and one vote for each scheme in the country. I say that that itself is an indication that the Congress-League scheme is approved all over the country and we are not going to take from it an inch. It has been said that the Government is prepared to grant to you Responsible Government but that you do not ask for it because the Congress-League scheme does not make Executive removable at the pleasure of the legislature : it cannot be technically said to be responsible. The pronouncement is that "Responsible Government" will be granted to you, that it should be granted to you by stages, so that the

first stage also must have something of Responsible Government. I do not think that that argument is right. The Government meaning is that one stage will be Municipal and Local, the second stage is provincial and the last stage is Central Government. That is not the meaning that I attach to it. I say that the Congress-League scheme does not provide for the removal of the Executive at the will of the legislature: true, but it gives you all the control over the Executive. We say that the Executive should be under the control of the legislature and that four-fifths of the legislative body should be elected. What does it mean? It means that the legislature which the Congress-League scheme demands will not be fully responsible in the sense of being able to remove the Executive, but it can transfer the Executive. If the Executive will not obey the legislature they may be

transferred to some other post. Why should you ask that the Executive should be removed? Once the Bureaucracy understands that they are responsible to the Legislative Councils, they are wise enough, intelligent enough to shape their future conduct accordingly; they are not fools. A beginning of the responsibility is made. The Executive are held responsible and they must take their orders from elected Legislative Councils. So, to say that the Congress-League scheme is not a beginning of Responsible Government is merely deceiving oneself and others by a use of words with which always wise and selfish men try to deceive the masses. The second objection urged against the Congress-League scheme is that it is better to begin from below, that it is better to build up from foundation than to begin with the top, so that you must begin with your Municipality, gradually

have District Boards under your control, then bring Provincial Governments under your control and then the Central Government. Even that argument is fallacious. The case may apply to the building of a new house where you cannot build the top without foundation, but the simile of a house does not apply to a political building, especially in the case of India. We in India are not children to be promoted from standard to standard until we pass our graduation either in Arts or in Law. We are full-grown people. We have had experience of governing Empires and Kingdoms in the past. (Cheers.) We fully know the art. Add to it that we have received western education which lays down certain principles of Government. We have learnt those principles and how to use those principles, having watched them so far in civilised countries. Are we not capable of carrying on

the Government of India from to-morrow if the Government is given into our hands? (Loud cheers.) When we say that Responsible Government should be granted to us by stages we cannot be meant to suppose that we should have training in Municipalities first, in District Boards afterwards, Provincial Legislative Councils next and then in the Supreme Legislative Council. There is no parallel between the two. The case of India is like that of an emasculated man who had lost or made to lose all his nervous power. In the case of a nervous disease, there is emasculation of the whole body and you have to begin the treatment with the brain and not with the toe. If you want to restore a man to health at once, you give tonic to the brain, the centre of all nervous system. So it is with India. If the present Government is unfit for the administration of the

country in the best interests of the Empire, the best remedy is to give tonic to the brain and that is Simla or Delhi. Unless that centre is made sound soon you cannot expect that any local remedy applied to the different parts of the body—to the foot or hand or other parts of the body—would be of any avail. So the Congress-League provides that we must have certain powers in the Central Government. If it is not made removable, we must at least be placed on a footing of equality. Half the members of the Executive should be our representatives, *i.e.*, they should be elected by the people. Thus we must go on building from the top. We do not want to divide the political Government in this country into parts, horizontal or vertical. We want to treat the whole man, and we want such cure to be administered as will cure his brain first and power over the lower limbs will gradually be

restored. Our scheme provides for that. To talk of Provincial Government when speaking of Imperial autonomy is to talk nonsense. We must have a share of the power in the Central Government. The control over the Municipalities remains with the Central Government, and you know how that power is being exercised and what actual independence you have in a Municipality. If you mean to have local Self-Government you must have power all through from top to bottom, *i.e.*, Responsible Government from top to bottom. In the Congress-League scheme it is provided that the Imperial Legislative Council should have four-fifths of its members elected and one-fifth nominated and that the legislature should have control over the Executive. I admit that this is not Responsible Government but it is really the beginning of Responsible Government. Take the case

of a minor whose estate is in charge of the Court of Wards. The minor having attained majority claims the estate from the Court of Wards. Suppose the defence of the Court of Wards is that they will transfer the power by parts, say the stables outside the house. What is the result? When that is done, the Court of Wards will say "We shall then think at a later date of transferring the whole house to the man." That defence would not be good enough in a Court of Law: any Judge will throw it away. The same is the case in this political struggle between the Bureaucracy and the Nation. Bureaucracy is the trustee of our interests. We have attained the age of majority; we claim our estate from Bureaucracy and men like Mr. Curtis are prepared to tell us: "Yes, we know that we shall have to transfer the whole power to you, but we shall see that it is transferred to you gradually when proper electorates-

are brought into existence, and that at some time in the course of a century or two when the preparations are complete or according to the Hindu time, some time in this Kali Yuga we shall transfer the power to you." That kind of defence ought not to be allowed for one moment. We are entitled to the possession of the whole house, and if we allow you to share our power with you in that house, it is a concession made for you in the hope that you will soon clear out of it. You have managed the house so long; you have been living in the house; we will allow you to live in the house for a longer time, but eventually you must acknowledge that from to-day we are masters of the house; then alone there can be any compromise; otherwise, none. The first merit of the Congress scheme is that it asks for a transfer of power to the elective body in the Central Government

itself. Without a share—an equal share—in the Central Government, it is hopeless to be able to govern the smaller portions of the Empire, such as Municipalities, Local Boards, etc., with any sense of Responsible Government. You must banish from your mind the idea of building from the bottom. That is not the analogy applicable to our scheme. We consent to nothing less than what is embodied in the Congress-League scheme. We must have control over the Central Government. The Government of India is one body from the gods of Simla to the lowest police man in the village. If you want to grant our right, if you think that our claims are just; we must have a share at the top. All these arguments against our scheme are intended to deceive you and are advanced by people whose idea is to remain in possession of the house even though

we have attained our majority and are entitled to the possession of the whole house. Mr. Bepin Chandra Pal admitted that we must have the whole Congress scheme *plus* something more. I want also that *plus* and not *minus*. But I claim the first term of this equation to begin with, the other terms will follow, and I shall be one with him when we fight for the second stage, and I ask him and entreat him to be one with me in fighting for the first. The second merit of our scheme is that it tries to build upon the existing foundation. It is not a new scheme requesting the Government to introduce any modification in the machinery of the government. The machinery has been in existence for hundred years or more. We want the Secretary of State, we want the Imperial Government, we want the Local Governments, we want the Municipality, we want the District Board, and

we want also the Bureaucracy to stay in the land and not to go out of it. We all want these, but we want certain transference of power, a decentralisation which will vest people with power in every one of these institutions. We do not want to change the institutions. We do not say that India should be governed by a Crown Prince from England or that the administration should be transferred to any Native Chief. We say "Retain your administrative machinery as it is". Our question is not with machinery but with power. The Government of India is composed of legislative and executive. We want no changes in Governor, Governor-General and also Executive Councils but we want that the power that vests in the Executive should be transferred to the legislature. We do not want to disturb the machinery. We do not want a new machinery to be

introduced. What we want is that there are certain wheels in the machinery which have appropriated to themselves the power of regulating the machinery, and we want that power to be transferred to other wheels. It is no new scheme: it is a tried scheme, a tried machinery. All that is required is transfer of power from one part of the machinery to another. The Secretary of State should be deprived of the power of controlling the Government of India. The true Government of India should be in India. What next? The Bureaucracy also agrees with us that power should be transferred by the Secretary of State to the present Government of India. We want it transferred to the Government of India and that the Executive should be under the control of the legislature. At present about half the members are elected in the Legislative Council. What is the

objection to electing a few more? All objection falls to the ground when you remember that when so many Imperial Council members are elected now and do their work often to the satisfaction of Government, all that we ask for in our scheme is to have a few more members of that kind and give them power to control the Executive. We are to build upon the existing foundation. The objection that our scheme is unworkable, untried and that it has never been tried in other countries is useless and harmful to our interests if the objection is put in a language which may deceive the unwary. The second objection was that if we have half the Executive elected and half the Executive nominated, there would be a deadlock. It is said that one-half of the Executive will be fighting against the other half and that the conflict would make the administration nugatory. I say no.

Our scheme says that the Governor shall have the power of veto and he would decide which side is correct and the administration will not be hampered in any way at all. We have made provision for it, and that provision does not suit the Bureaucrats who are in power and they think that when power is shared like that they must act with greater respect to popular opinion. Lastly, I say that our scheme is better than any other scheme for another reason, and that reason is that no other scheme will be so compatible with the wishes of the British Parliament as ours is. Mr. Curtis and Sir Valentine Chirol have been forced—and I do not think quite willingly—to accept the pronouncement of the Government as the basis of future work. Government having declared the policy—those two gentlemen would have been very glad if the Government had not declared their policy—they

have accepted that policy. But what are they trying to do with it? Given that proclamation, how much of it, in fact what is the lowest proportion of it, that can be conceded to the people? They wish to draw the minimum length provided for in that proclamation. That is the problem before Mr. Curtis and Sir Chirol. Our problem is how long the line can be drawn. I must warn you not to accept any other scheme or to be carried away by it, simply because the author of it professes to limit it. I therefore commend this resolution for your unanimous acceptance. (Loud and prolonged cheers.)”

Speeches of

Lok. Tilak.

This collection of his speeches, published recently, contains all his recent political addresses.

PRICE R^e. ONE EACH.

SONS OF INDIA, LTD.,

10, ESPLANADE, MADRAS.

Lok. TILAK
A Life Sketch

, PRICE 4 As. EACH

THE SONS OF INDIA, Ltd.

10, ESPLANADE, MADRAS.

Lok. TILAK.

His four speeches on
Swaraj which formed the
subject of his recent pro-
secution, and a full account
of that Security Case.

PRICE 12 As. EACH.

SONS OF INDIA, LTD.

10, ESPLANADE, MADRAS.

The B. I. Press, Madras.

Reprints for Home Rulers No 2

METHODS OF POLITICAL WORK

ANNIE BESANT

SONS OF INDIA Ltd
10 ESPLANADE MADRAS

INTRODUCTION

A word of introduction is probably necessary to this reprint of the lecture by Mrs. Besant in December 1914. She spoke at a time when it seemed to many that British Government had decided to give Self-Government to India, and many felt, including Mrs. Besant, whether complete Self-Government may not come a little too early for us to digest. She was then also working very hard for the union of the two parties in the Congress and also to banish as early as possible the revolutionary movement from this country. It is at such a time that she delivered the address here reprinted. Instead of our getting the complete Home Rule at once, it is doubtful whether we shall have even the reforms asked for in the Memorandum of the 19. Still, the suggestions Mrs. Besant has put forward in this lecture may be very useful for us to follow. This lecture will, we hope, be a complete reply to those who affirm shame-facedly that Mrs. Besant was a revolutionary agitator.

METHODS OF POLITICAL WORK

Friends :—I am to speak to you to night on the methods of political work. You will readily understand that, in choosing such a topic at such a time as this, there is a distinct object in my mind, to lay before you certain principles along which political action may naturally be pursued, to try to show you how when you have chosen your line of political action, you should try to understand the methods which are either suitable to that which you have chosen, or unsuitable, thereby retarding that which you really desire to attain. For it is necessary for any sane and thoughtful political work and propaganda that you should first know the aim towards which you desire to direct your efforts, and having definitely chosen your aim, then as deliberately to choose the methods which are in consonance with the aim that you have selected. Unless some such rational method, is adopted, you waste half your time by running along false lines, by trying paths which are no thorough-fares, by a chance adoption of one method at one moment, which a little later you find inconsistent with the objects you are trying to attain. Without clarity and accuracy of view, no system of real and useful political action is possible, and I want to show you, if I can, from the English struggles of the immediate past, the methods which are being used in the nation which is gradually growing towards democracy.

Charles Bradlaugh is a name to conjure with I sometimes fancy that they have not studied his methods nor understand the way in which he attained the various triumphs of his life. In trying to put some of these methods before you I shall point out what is very obvious that the conditions here are unfortunately different from conditions in England and that you must modify your methods to suit the environments in which you are. Then I shall ask you whether you realise what is meant by the Self Government for which the Congress is working whether you realise that before you can govern yourselves collectively you have to learn to govern individually and that any amount of ill regulated and uncontrolled enthusiasm felt by many, is not the way in which political liberty can be wisely obtained and Self Government for India can be reached. So little is the time perchance that you have before you will be called on to exercise that inherent right of every citizen to control the Government under which he lives, so little time for preparation so great is the lack of real understanding of the demands democracy makes on democrats—such that no autocracy can make—that unless you realise the nature of the demands you will fail in your attempt and so throw back political liberty for centuries. This war is changing everything the attitude of England to India and India to England and the attitude of the Empire to India and the value of Indian civilization and Indian life. But you cannot spring with single leap into the power, ability and knowledge that are wanted wisely to govern a mighty country like this and the one fear that I felt lately has been that Self Government may come into your reach before you are really ready to grasp it and to use it readily when you have attained it.

It was my good fortune in my younger days to work hand in hand with Mr. Charles Bradlaugh. I may say that he was practically my political tutor. And although I was in the political atmosphere in my own home, I none the less took active part in politics; but only studied them until I had the happiness of meeting the greatest of popular leaders, and living side by side with him, working with him and acting as his right hand in moments of peril, so that I realised the powers of the people and also their weakness, the danger of popular leadership as well as the splendour of achievements possible to such powers. One thing was very marked in Charles Bradlaugh. He was in the noblest sense a demagogue, that is, leader of the people. He did not allow those who were following him to sway his judgment or to make him change the line of action on which he had determined; and if Mr. Charles Bradlaugh was sometimes a terror to his enemies, I can assure you that sometimes he was a terror to his friends as well.

For one thing he always said:—"I will not have violence, I will not have disorder" and that he held as the very centre of his political propaganda. What was his exact position? You must remember I am thinking of the times when there was much difficulty in Ireland, when the Habeas Corpus Act was suspended, when public meetings could not be held. I learnt the lessons of true democratic growth in times of difficulty and danger that laid down a great truth which I venture to commend to you. It was that where-ever there were constitutional means open whereby reforms can be gained and popular liberty can be widened, resort to force was a crime against the country. That so long as any other way was open, so long as there were Parliamentary or constitutional ways of

patriot who loves his country has any right to plunge his country into disaster, into violence or into political crime. He realised what a hot, tempered man does not realise, that he can stir a mob for action, but cannot stop or check it; and so in the political work, he laid down the rule that by using law, even if it is bad law, you can alter it legally and so get rid of the burden that presses on you. In the second place, even when you are in the right, do not do anything to provoke a strife that you may not be able to control. And lastly, the farseeing political leader in times of danger will never let his followers "go" but he will always say "come". As he was just beginning to pass within the shadow of death, he said that there was not one woman who could reproach him that politically he led her husband to trouble. And that was a noble record.

Now, what are the two ways of political action? One constitutional, by way of reform, and the other by way of revolution and of everything that leads up to revolution. Let us take them and look at them. When Mr. Bradlaugh came into political life, the law in England touching the Press exacted securities from every editor, proprietor, printer and publisher. No paper could be issued without giving security, first lodging £20 as security against any possible blasphemy or any possible sedition that he might commit in the course of conduct of that paper. You will naturally ask, how did Mr. Bradlaugh solve it? He did not give security, and when the treasury asked for it he wrote a very polite note: "As I am an unbeliever and a republican, I should forfeit my security once a week, as mine is a weekly paper, and as I am not a rich man, I cannot afford to forfeit £20 a week." Then he went on publishing

his paper. They wrote and said that they would prosecute him who was responsible. He wrote back: "I am responsible, I am the editor, printer and publisher, and if you will send a policeman to buy a copy of the paper, I shall attend on him and sell a copy myself, in order that you may take action against me." Accordingly, a policeman came and bought a copy of the *National Reformer*. Mr. Bradlaugh was an admirable lawyer, and if you want to gain constitutional reforms, you need not be ashamed that the Congress is a Congress of lawyers, because it is by the lawyers you will gain the ability gradually to change constitutional laws that press upon you. You cannot do it by running your heads against the walls of the law. Well, he sold his paper. They issued the first writ in the prosecution. But not being aware that they were dealing with a very careful person, they issued the writ for a particular number about a fortnight later than the particular one which they had bought. Mr Bradlaugh said nothing. They went through all their business. The whole business of law was gone through until they had finished their case. Then he got up and said that there was no evidence against him. "There is no proof that I published that paper." The Judge took up his notes and said: "Here is your own writing. Why do you say there is no evidence? You say here that you are the printer, publisher and editor." Immediately Mr. Bradlaugh said: "My Lord, I did not give notice that in May I was in any way connected with the paper. This paper is of May 18th and I had no connection with that then." Mr. Bradlaugh had always a wicked way of behaving in court. He stood there quietly for a minute and then said: "My Lord, with your permission I wish to enquire. If a burglary happened in house No. 4.

is the evidence for a burglary in house No. 18 in the same street sufficient for a burglary in No 4" On that the judge lost his temper and dismissed the case (Laughter.) What was the result of that? That during all the time of the enquiry, though he was running into all kinds of expense and trouble, but he was agitating the country against the imposition of security, and when at last they took up the whole matter in Parliament, Mr. Mill was one of those who helped; and finally in despair they abolished the whole of the security business which fettered the press. You can very often, when dealing with unjust legislation, get the better of it if you deal with it legally and carefully and wear out the people and gradually exhaust them. In that way Mr. Bradlaugh won some of his greatest victories. True that is not applicable to your press law here, because you cannot fight legally when you are fighting against autocracy. You might learn, yet, a method of political action suited to a country like India when it is possible to appeal to a Court of law, and when you are dealing with legal questions, and so gradually, by skill in argument, you can bring about a better condition of things.

Now let me take another case, the most critical in which he was ever engaged. You remember he was elected to Parliament and that he thought that under the law as it stood he had a right to affirm or to take the oath. He claimed to affirm. The House of Commons refused the application and he vacated his seat. He went again to his constituency which again elected him and came up to the table of the House of Commons and said that he was prepared to take the oath, they said that he could not take it; that since he was not a believer, he ought not to be allowed to

take the oath. He said he was duly elected by the constituency, and if he was willing to fulfil every part of the law, the Parliament had no right to impose a new condition. He looked up the old law of Parliament and he fought his first fight in law courts. While he was fighting these cases in the law courts, he went everyday to the House of Commons and sat outside, when he had a right to sit inside. Meetings were held all over the country, meetings of thousands of men demanding that Parliament shall admit a properly elected member to its ranks. He was elected some three times, everytime he was rejected. One time they put him in the Clock Tower, because they were afraid of the popular trouble outside. Then they barred him from the seat and he fought it in a court of law and went up to the House of Lords. At last, in the House of Lords, he won his case. But before that happened came the worst stage of his troubles which was also the most instructive. There is an ancient right in England that 7 people might go to Parliament with a petition—Parliament guards against being terrorised by a mob by not allowing more than 7 people at a time to assemble within a certain area around the Parliamentary House. What was then to be done? There was his right of petitioning, and the people came up by thousands, miners in South Wales, Agriculturists from all parts of the country—they came up not in tens and scores but in thousands to protest against the exclusion of Charles Bradlaugh from the people's House. He had made up his mind to test the question legally again, and the way in which it was arranged by him was that he was to walk up to the lobby of the House of Commons where he had a right to go. Then the Head of the Police should put his hand upon his shoulder

stop his going any further and at that he would at once yield. That was a technical assault, and he wanted a technical assault in order that he might be able to appeal to the law courts against what he believed to be an illegal exclusion from his seat.

In order to show the popular feeling, scores of thousands came up to London ready to support his cause and then came the difficulty. These men, passionately devoted to him, ready to fight for him and ready to carry him by force into the people's House, how could he leave them outside while he himself was undergoing a technical assault within? They have a legal right to go in parties of 7, each carrying a petition to Parliament that Parliament will do justice to Northampton. There is no limit to any number of 7. Gradually 7 by 7 filled the whole of the Westminster Hall. Then the great gates of the Parliamentary Square were closed. Outside, the whole street was crammed with men who were furious and devoted. These stood near the lobby of the house on the top of some of the steps left vacant by the Police. The crowd below were holding up their petition shouting out "petition, petition." The Police looked out. Suddenly we heard great crashing going on inside the house. For one moment a temptation came to rescue their leader. To do that was to act against the agreement, and so I threw myself between the Police and the crowd. The Police would not believe that I could stop the crowd. But I reminded the people that Mr. Bradlaugh would not allow fight between them and the Police. Finally we found him outside, ejected by brutal violence from the people's House, where he had a right to sit. And standing there with a ring of Police around him and thousands of men within

sight, did he change his method and make a revolution? No. He determined that he would win by law and not by force. He would not allow methods to be used which, carried out to its logical result, meant revolution. He was again re-elected at the next general election. Then he went up, and no further difficulty was put in his way in taking his seat and he sat only for a short while in Parliament. He was always protesting against the past wrong that was done him, until, as he lay dying, they moved the repeal of every resolution against him as against the liberty of England and the rights of electors. There you have a method of politics that I would ask you to consider: to deliberately and determinedly stand by the law; even against physical violence inflicted by law-breakers on the supporters of law. When he was sitting for years in silence outside the House though he had a right of speech, rather than let many suffer in the defence of one, often had I said to him: "Mazzini fought and Garibaldi fought; many a revolution was successful." His answer was: "As long as there was any method left for liberty, except violence, so long that method shall be chosen in preference to any step which may mean revolution."

Now let us refer to another instance, which will bring me to the Socialist Party in England. It is divided into two wings, one wing works for the constitutional reforms through Parliament, through Municipalities and through all the many bodies that represent the popular will. Those belong to the Fabian Society. They are constitutional Socialists. They say, "you cannot have socialism until you have the people educated. Else you have only the form, but never reality. Let us work by agitation step by step and by public meetings, above all by education and joining

ourselves with the Parliamentary Labour Party that will bring about changes in the Parliamentary Constitution" The other party, the social Democrats, the revolutionary party, they will not have a quiet way of Parliamentary action. They say, "you get them by fighting with a strong hand," and so these two parties are there—both Socialists—but differing in method. The latter understand that anything that provokes the conflict of force has, as its only logical outcome, a change by revolution. Now that party is dying on and what did they do in a practical way? Nothing, and the association vanished. The other party, the constitutional, has gradually socialised the whole of municipal institutions in England. They have gradually, by Parliamentary methods, brought about a large number of reforms for which they were working, so that now when the impetus of war came, everybody was prepared for socialism. And you have Government seizing railways, fixing prices for grains, and yet not one man has gone into jail for breach of the law and not one has suffered any penalty, because he was advocating that which now has been gained.

Now take the case of Ireland. In Ireland, they had two ways which were successive and not simultaneous, as in the Socialist agitation. They tried methods of terror and they failed. They started the boycott of everybody. The word "boycott" was never used there as a weapon against the Government but only against individuals for a commonsense reason. Boycott of the individual is effective. You can frighten one man, but you cannot frighten Government. I don't like terrorism even of individuals. It is always sure to fail. Ireland failed in the method. Remember that in England where there is more freedom than

in Ireland, no effective step was taken in the gaining of Home Rule until Boycott and revolutionary and violent methods were definitely given up for Parliamentary methods. Some noble and splendid patriots went into jail. They failed because at the present stage of human evolution, the commonsense of the majority will not tolerate useless violence and knows that every method of terrorism inevitably fails.

I know you are in difficulties here which do not exist in England, because you have a growing democracy there while here we have an autocracy. But the spirit may be adopted to your environments. You can aim at democracy, you can aim at nothing else. How are you to try to prepare yourselves for democratic triumphs along democratic lines? If you are earnest in acquiring democracy, you must first become democrats. You cannot build houses without bricks. Now what is a democrat? He is a man who gives free speech to all and who shows tolerance to the opinions of every one and who bows to the will of the majority and instead of rebelling against it tries to turn it into a minority by convincing people that he is in the right side and not opposing it. That is not the democratic method that some of our people are following here. Some of our friends in the United Provinces suffer very much under what is called the Hindu-Muhammadan question. You have not that question here to the same extent. It is a burning question in the North. It is a question which forces itself on everyman's attention. The Congress, they say, does not fight for them. The Hindu-Muhammadan question is shirked by the Congress. How then do they act? They stay away. You can never convince peoples by staying away; and they cannot serve their enemies better than by staying away and leaving others

to carry on things exactly as they like. And so I wrote to a friend: "You can never hope to get the Congress by skulking away in Allahabad. You want the Congress to take up the question. Come here and bring up the question from one Congress to another, make your lives unpleasant to all people by pressing the question and then when you have educated the Congress, you will carry it out." You cannot win the democratic people if you are not ready for battle. If you cannot dare to be defeated, you are not fit for democracy. You are trying to use autocracy under the shadow of democracy, and it is the most fatal political blunder you can commit.

There are a number of people in this country who do not like everything that the Congress does. Nobody can please everybody, especially in the education of democracy. All you have a right to is a right to persuade other people that you are right. That is the way by which England gradually won her freedom. That training in method which admits the majority has the right to rule and it bows to the majority when the majority is against your own wish. Let your opponent have his say. Learn your opponent's weakness. Listen to him carefully and see where you may be at fault, or whether he is talking unwisely. These are the methods by which you can make improvements in democratic methods. You have a splendid organisation in the Congress and you want only men to work it. Its constitution is admirable, with one small amendment which can be carried out if you educate the people into it. What is the good of a district committee which never meets, what is the good of a taluk committee that never tries to educate villagers under them? If enthusiasm is wanted in the Congress, it is not because of the lack of constitution but it is because of the want of

work from one year's end to another, which does not stir enthusiasm because it is work which appeals to the hearts of the young. What is needed is to support your Congress everywhere. It is the only representative body you have. It ought to include all those who agree with the one aim of Self-Government with one method of constitutional means of gaining Self-Government. That is the creed of the Congress, and without that, men cannot work together. The main question between constitutional and revolutionary action is a gulf which no Congress can pass, and the sooner that is recognised the better.

I have been touching on the fundamental questions of political method; and I believe that Self-Government is comparatively near. I now come back to the point from which I started. Would it not be well for you to prepare for it now? The Congress is the voice of the educated India. You have no other political weapon, and the Congress is the only way in which you can reach the hearts and minds of democracy in England. Improve it, but do not try to destroy instead of building it up.

Come into it by hundreds. Send your delegates by hundreds. But remember it is not a Parliament. It is not a body in which every part of the nation may be represented. It is only a national organisation for gaining, by certain constitutional means, certain definite reforms. It is national, as the National Liberal Club is national. It has a right to call itself national, not as representing every section of the people, but as a group of men to gain a definite end by definite means. I would ask you as I would ask in England, to think of your own country and the possibilities open before her. If you throw

aside an opportunity of showing yourself as an united nation with a single voice you will be throwing away an opportunity which may not return for centuries. Is not India dearer to you than your own feelings of grievances or reverses? What do your feelings matter before the call of the Motherland which asks for help? There is no winning freedom for her save with the willing help of the very best types of men and women in England. Now they are beginning to understand you. Give them a chance. Do not make them despair of India by the folly of disunion over petty things. Many of you have been thinking, praying and hoping for her and now when there is a chance of realisation of your hopes and prayers will you throw it away by childish disagreement? by playing with politics indicating revolution when there is no ground for it? Save the country for the love of the country is greater than the love of the husband and the wife or the parent and the child. Realise your responsibility and talk neither wild words nor do wild actions, but join hand in hand—so called extremists and so-called moderates—all who are willing to accept the creed of the Congress which is Self-Government within the Empire and the use of constitutional means only. Agree on that, and India will rejoice in your decision and work so that by the time the Congress meets next year there may be a record of work for India which shall justify your claim for Self Government. (Loud Cheers)

Non-Co-operation

(FOUR LECTURES)

BIPIN CHANDRA PAL



PUBLISHED BY
SAMARENDRA KUMAR NAG,

THE
INDIAN BOOK CLUB
College Street Market Calcutta

1920

PRINTED BY K. C. BOSE,
AT THE STANDARD DRUG PRESS,
45, Amherst Street, CALCUTTA.

for the first time in the history of our present struggle for national emancipation, the weapon of passive resistance, Bengal, whose young men in their hundreds and thousands have given the price of their fidelity to this principle of Non-Co-operation (applause), Bengal is not likely to go along with the other Provinces in the Congress that is coming next month, in this matter. These rumours impelled me, inspite of the very indifferent condition of my health just now, to take the risk—if risk at all it be—to appear before you and to present to you, so far as I can, the whole question of Non-Co-operation whether for or against.

SIGNIFICANCE OF "NON-CO OPERATION MOVEMENT"

Now, gentlemen, I will at once tell you that personally I have watched this movement with the greatest interest. I have studied this movement from various points of view, and I may tell you that as the result of long thought and study—whatever may be the worth of my thought and study—I have personally come to the conviction that Non-Co-operation is our last chance (applause) for winning, if it pleases God, our national freedom (applause). And I will tell you why. With a view to understand the significance of this, we must consider calmly from all sides of view, without partiality and without prejudice, without rash generalisation and without timid reservation, the actualities before us. What are the actualities before you? Where do you stand to-day?

The great and fundamental fact of British domination in this country has been brought home to us

—most cruelly it must be said, but I am thankful for the light—in last year's Punjab affairs. What is the meaning of it? What was the meaning of the Punjab atrocities? What was the meaning of the declaration of martial law after having concocted a story of open rebellion in the Punjab? (cries of shame, shame) what is the meaning of the Report of the Hunter Committee, I mean the Majority Report? What is the meaning of the Government of India's Despatch on that Report? What is the meaning of the considered opinion of the present Coalition Cabinet with regard to that Report and the incidents of last year? What, finally, is the meaning of the debate in both Houses of Parliament, not on the Punjab atrocities, not on the policy of martial law administration, which was deliberately shunted away by both officials and non-officials (cries of shame), but on a petty, insignificant, contemptible incident in that affair, namely, the atrocities committed by General Dyer? I have nothing to say against General Dyer. I have no complaint to make against what he did. That had to be done to maintain the foundation of British rule in India as it has been conceived by the present British Bureaucracy here and the Cabinet over there in England (applause). What is the foundation of that rule? Physical domination. We must get rid of our ancient delusions. These are not times for cherishing pleasant illusions. We must get rid of the illusions that have been bred in us by the teaching of British historians and the utterances of British statesmen and politicians. The real, patent, cruel,

solid truth about it is that British domination in India means government by an army of occupation (Cries of hear hear) Is not that a fact? The Punjab says it is The Government of India's Despatch says it is The Hunter Committee's Report says it is The Cabinet's considered opinion upon the Hunter Committee's Report declared it to be so The House of Commons debate and the House of Lords debate showed that the foundation of British rule in India is the military power the brute force the superior organisation and the improved methods of murder (cries of shame) which our rulers command Please do not cry shame Take these things into your heart consider what these things mean now and for your future and then approach the problem before you It is military domination It was covered up all these years genuinely covered benevolently concealed, for our good and for their benefit But the fact has been brought out by the Punjab episode and the things that have followed that episode

BENGAL AND THE PUNJAB

It is not, however really a revelation to some of us, Extremist thinkers and politicians We knew it all along We had seen a glimpse of it during the Swadeshi agitation in Bengal It did not come out in all its naked cruelty in Bengal because of the different training the different mentality, the different moral atmosphere of your province It did come out in that cruel nakedness in Bengal

Why, I will tell you. Because of the preaching of Surendra Nath Banerjea in the early and unregenerate stage of his public life. Let us not forget it in these days. Because of the inspiration which Surendra Nath Banerjea brought to us from the history of the struggle for independence in America, from the history of the Shikhs and the Mahrattas, from the life of Mazzinni and Garibaldi, from the struggle for national emancipation in Ireland under Thomas and Davis and Duffy in the early years of the last century, and from other historical sources. Because of these historical inspirations and the spirit of political freedom awakened in Bengal, Bengal refused to kowtow to the officials. Bengal never bent low to make obeisance to every "topiwallah" that passed along the streets of Calcutta or any other city. Bengal never encouraged her leaders at any time to pay reverence to the "huzoors." Bengal met the Englishman—official and non-official—face to face as equal to equal. Because of that mentality, that moral atmosphere for which—I repeat again—we are indebted to the early teachings and inspiration of Surendra Nath Banerjee (applause)—on account of those things, the things that were done in the Punjab were impossible to be attempted in Bengal. We all know that there was talk of martial law and no damned nonsense—but they dared not apply it in Bengal. Because the cowardly Bengali—Lepel Griffin's grasshopper Bengali—though he had never shouldered arms, had cultivated a mind and a heart, a courage and a spirit of self assertion and opposition to injustice and oppression which

would not stand all that nonsense about martial law,—General Dyer or no General Dyer, bombing aeroplanes or no bombing aeroplanes. Therefore, what was done in the Punjab could not be done in Bengal. But the spirit was here, the idea was here, the desire was here ; martial law and no damned nonsense, that was the cry fifteen years ago in Bengal, but it did not materialise here somehow or other. Therefore I say we knew it. It was really no new revelation to us in Bengal that the foundation of British rule had been laid upon the physical domination, the superior military organisation, the improved weapons of warfare at the command of our masters.

But all this time we were thinking that, after all, they have not the necessary man-power to terrorise over Bengal or over India. They are a handful of men, have a small bit of territory, the United Kingdom, and their man-power is contemptible compared to the possibilities of man-power in India. That was our hope. The inference from this was that the British ruled in this country really not by superior physical force but through the passive acquiescence of the people of the country to their rule. That was the secret of it. We had seen it years and years ago. And Prof. Seeley has put it on record that if the people of India made up their minds to shake off this domination, they could do so without wasting an ounce of powder or a dozen shots. I don't quote him exactly, but that is the substance of what he said in his "Expansion of England." If India wishes to— If India wills it, by an effort of the national will

she can get rid of the domination of the British. We thought "all right, everybody has his day, let these people also have their day, but when India will awaken, when India will will it to be so, it will come of itself." That was, Mr. Chairman, how we felt and thought fifteen years ago. That was how we felt and thought ten years ago. That was how many of us felt and thought five years ago. That is what some of us may still be thinking and feeling. That was what I personally thought six months or a year back. But we cannot think in that way to-day, and what is the reason? The reason is this. The man-power of England is not able to cope with the requirements of physical domination over so extensive a country. That cannot be gainsaid by any one. The man-power of India has been used against Indian freedom hitherto. The Sikhs, the Pathans, the Gurkhas are our men. They have been used by the British for the subjugation of the people of India. They are used still for putting down inconvenient movements among the Indian people. But there has been a new awakening in these quarters.

A NEW AWAKENING IN THE MARTIAL RACES.

I do not think that after what happened last year in the Punjab there is much prospect of fruitful and safe recruiting there. I do not think that after the dismemberment of Turkey any British politician will dare to enlist in large numbers the Pathans from our frontier regions. The two great sources of recruitment are practically closed. The Government know it and they have therefore

been entering into friendly relationship with Nepal and have commenced to pay six lakhs, I think, a year, no my friend says they have promised to pay ten lakhs a year—to the Nepal Durbar for the privilege of exploiting the military possibilities of the Nepalese population in the interest of the preservation of peace and order in British India (laughter) But will it do? If this is the situation, I would say, 'let us all go to sleep because what has happened among Shikhs and Mahomedans, cannot take long to happen to Nepal and the Gurkhas also. Because the spirit of freedom, the spirit of national self respect and national self assertion is abroad and it is a dangerous thing. It first awakens in the heart of a few individuals and from them the fire spreads from man to man until one whole province is a conflagration—not physical but moral—and it spreads from one province to another. Fifteen years ago the whole of India practically held back from the advanced political activities of Bengal. Fifteen years ago at the Congress of 1906 Bengal stood up for Non Co operation or Boycott as we used to call it. Those of you who were present then will remember that when we proposed a boycott resolution in the Congress of 1906 and I put what was described as a sinister interpretation upon the words 'boycott movement' in that resolution, there was trembling there was consternation among the spokesmen and leaders of the other Indian Provinces. They stood up one after another to drop it as a hot potato (laughter)

" what is the case to-day? The Punjab which would

not touch our boycott has taken up non-co-operation. As regards the United Provinces, my friends told me, in 1906—"it is all very well for you to talk of these things, but we have not been able to forget the memories of the Mutiny and have no desire to say or do the things you say and do." But the United Provinces to-day have forgotten or got rid of the memories of the Mutiny. This is the situation to-day. And generalising from these things it can be safely said that the things that have happened to the mentality of the Punjabi and to the mentality of the Pathan, will not take so very long to happen to the mentality of the worshipper of Durga and Kali in Nepal (applause). What then? The situation is very hopeful—you think. It may so seem to you. It would have been hopeful if the war had not turned the world topsy turvy and if the Military Imperialism of Great Britain had not established itself over very extensive territories in the African Continent. That is what you have to consider very carefully. What will it mean to the future of India? I do not refer to Mesopotamia, because though they have sat down to eat Mesopotamia we do not know whether they will be able to digest it (laughter). They have hardly been able to put it in their mouth as yet. They have only been looking longingly on Mesopotamia (laughter). They are playing with the Arab chiefs. Mesopotamia is at present in an unsettled state. Therefore, I do not refer to Mesopotamia. I think it will take a very long time to bring Mesopotamia under complete control and to be able to exploit, whatever little man-power there

of downtrodden races therefore it is right with us and not right with them (laughter)

I want to ask you therefore is there any reason to hope that Great Britain will not do in Africa what Germany, General Smuts said, Germany proposed to do there

THE NEW MENACE.

I do not see it I do not believe that the Military Imperialism of Great Britain will hesitate for a moment to adopt the same policy and pursue the same objects as the Germans wanted to. In fact, in view of the prospects of recruitment in India, it will be forced upon British Military Imperialism. And the question is, what will it mean to you and me? These African mercenaries will be able to replace our Indian mercenaries and they will enable future General Dyers to bring in the African Kaffir soldier to meet inconvenient situations in different Provinces in India. What will you do then? It will be pure physical might, because Africa has got sufficient population to supply the British with an army of occupation which will be a real army of occupation. This, gentlemen, is the situation as I understand it, and it will take—that is my next point—just ten years for the British to organise to educate to train and equip the African hordes, and these ten years are the utmost limit of the life of your struggle for freedom. After these ten years, if you cannot attain your freedom in the meantime, where will you
?

OUR IDEAL.

By freedom I do not mean or understand a paper constitution, what was described as responsible government in the Announcement of August 20th, 1917. By freedom I do not mean any change, however radical it may be, in the Legislative or the Executive. By freedom I mean the absolute right of my people to organise, to control and to direct the defences of their country (applause). That is the backbone of all policies. By freedom I mean the right of the people of India to organise the man-power of their country under their own control, under their own direction, under their own officership, or under officers imported from other countries who will be subject to the orders of the people's own Government (applause and cries of hear, hear). By freedom I understand the control of the Military. By freedom I understand the control of the National Navy. By freedom I understand the control of National Air Force. By freedom I understand unrestricted opportunities for scientific research and inventions with a view to cope with the advanced researches and inventions of other nations of the world in the matter of economic development and military defence (cries of hear, hear).

THE M.-C. REFORMS.

You have not got these rights, and the Montagu-Chelmsford Report does not contemplate the transfer of these rights to you. It is not in the Announcement. That Announcement promised the

increased association of Indians with every branch of the administration. This they are doing. The latest news is evidence of this. Srijiut Satyendra Prasanna Sinha—I hope he will take no offence (laughter)—Non-Co-operation in the first stage, according to Mr. Gandhi, is renunciation of titles and honorary offices. I have no title to give up. You have none (laughter). We can do one thing. We will not recognise these titles (laughter). In the two news papers under my control, I do not recognise these titles. If you open to-day's "Independent," you will find Mr. Narayan Chandavarkar not Sir Narayan Chandavarkar, Dr. P. C. Roy not Sir P. C. Roy, Mr. Ashutosh Chaudhuri not Sir Ashutosh Choudhuri. They are dearer to me as Srijiuts and Babus (Applause) than as lords and lordlings (Applause). Now the highest point in the increasing association of Indians with every branch of the administration is reached in the proposed appointment—it has been unofficially declared—of Satyendra Prasanna Sinha to be the first Governor of Behar. Some of my friends are in high glee at it. They say that we are going back to the days of Akbar (laughter). Are you willing to go back to the days of Akbar (cries of—no)? What are you out for? A benevolent despotism Moslem or Hindu? Are you likely to be satisfied even by the reincarnation of Sri Rām Chandra as the King of India (cries of no no)? Thank you. We are out for the freedom of the individual citizen in India, we are out for the new democracy of India, we are out for freedom, we are out for the ideal govern-

ment in which every adult member of the population male and female will have a voice in the making of laws and in the control of the Executive. Akbar is too old for me (laughter). Sri Ram Chandra, I honour him, but he also would not suit the twentieth century in Calcutta or India. I want that whoever may rule me will be subject to my control. I want that whoever controls the State in my country shall be obedient to the will of my people (applause). Akbar employed Todarmull Moslems employed many Hindus, the British have done it rather late in the day, but this will not satisfy us.

THE CONTROL OF THE MILITARY.

The Announcement of August 20th, 1917, did not touch the fundamental problem of our military affairs. The Montagu-Chelmsford Report on page 204—If I remember aright—distinctly says,—paragraph 323, discussing the Civil Service, that it would hardly be consistent with the self-respect of Indians to find the last remnant of their British connection in the military defence of India; in Englishmen defending their borders. Who said that we wanted Englishmen to defend our borders? (laughter) We never wanted it. We never wanted that we should carry on the civil administration and that British Tommies should fight our battles on the frontier. The world has never known of such an incongruity. He who fights is he who rules. Mr. Fred Smith now Lord—I forget these names as they jump so suddenly from:

the Lower House to the Upper House (a voice, Lord Birkenhead)—now Lord Birkenhead—it is a long jump from Fred Smith to Lord Birkenhead—when he was the Right Hon'ble Fred, E. Smith, speaking on the Women's Franchise Bill laid down that the old principle was no representation no taxation but the new principle is no fighting to defend the country no vote I think that this is the saner principle of the two We do not want the hideous incongruity that England should defend our borders and that we should rule the country As I have said the Montagu Chelmsford Report did not contemplate the transfer of military control The Montagu Chelmsford Act does not provide it

What is the military situation to day? Have you noticed it that in the course of a few days a new Bill will be brought before the Imperial Legislative Council, the Indian Auxiliary Forces Bill Have you noticed that in this Bill the old volunteer system under which Indians were excluded will be practically reintroduced in a better form in India? Have you noticed it that the 'Englishman' and other respectable organs of Anglo Indian opinion in this country, discussing the findings of the Hunter Committee Report referring to last year's atrocities in the Punjab, declared that conscription must be imposed on every alien man of military age in this country with a view to the protection of their life and property and the honour of the women folk of the Anglo Indian and European communities Mr Montagu said, 'No, no I cannot do that that will be an unjust measure That is Mr Montagu that

is what Mr. Montagu replied, but what has he granted? Under the new Bill, will my son be able to be enlisted without any difficulty in any Volunteer corps? Will they allow us to organise our own volunteer corps as the Europeans do? Even before, in the European volunteer corps Indians might be admitted if only the members of those corps were agreeable to their admission. Will that restriction be removed? It cannot be removed unless and until I am allowed to organise my own black or brown corps, to have my own officers, to have the future control of my corps in my own hands. Well, they are not going to do it. The Auxiliary Forces Bill will be there and it will be a menace to your freedom in India, because if you become inconvenient, if you become rowdy, if the cause of peace and order is disturbed by you in any shape or form, then these gentlemen will be called out to keep you in order.

Now, that is the situation. Therefore, I say, that 'unless you can get the full control of your defences by land, by sea and by air in your own hands, unless you can get the freest and fullest opportunity of carrying on scientific researches and inventions with a view to the utilisation of your national resources, unless you can get these things within the next ten years, your future and fate is practically sealed—humanly speaking. I do not know what God will do. He can do wonders. But, humanly speaking, this is the gloomy prognosis before you. What are you going to do? The problem before you is that you must obtain full national autonomy, full control of every department of

your national life—civil and military; you must attain this within the next ten years if you are to live as a free nation among the free nations of the world in modern times. If you fail to do it you are gone. How are you going to attain this? Is it conceivable that waiting upon the pleasure of the British Parliament, following the lead of the Montagu Act, you will be able to obtain your full national freedom in ten years? The Montagu Act lays it down distinctly that at the end of ten years there will be appointed a Parliamentary Commission and that Commission will examine what you have done in these ten years. They will examine to what extent Co-operation has been received from you in the working of the new Act. They will examine to what extent reliance may be placed upon your public spirit and upon your sense of responsibility. And if you can stand the test of this Parliamentary Committee, then there may be another step—not in responsible government—but towards responsible government. That is the sum total of the Montagu Act. Can you believe Gentlemen, that by working the Montagu Act—however faithfully and loyally you may work it—you will be able to secure the control of your national defences as the first step towards national emancipation during these ten years? If not, and that is the only answer which must be given to this question, what then? What can you do? You must do something that will compel the authorities, something that will force the hands of the British Government here and the British Cabinet across the seas, to do you all that is necessary for supplying yourself for

national freedom and national self-government. How can you do it ? You can only force their hands by withholding your own hand from their administrative machine. That is the first principle of Non-Co-operation. Take your hands off the administration and every thing connected with the administration. Withhold co-operation as far as it may be. Mark these words, Gentlemen, "so far as it may be" and I use these words deliberately after mature thought and consideration. I say that, because it is impossible for any people in any country, whatever the form of its government, to live in that country and under that Government by refusing to co-operate with that government in every way. Absolute Non-Co-operation is an impossibility. And I do not think that those who are wanting the country to put its seal upon this campaign of Non-Co-operation are such fools as to mean by Non-Co-operation the absolute withdrawal of all co-operation from the Government. We cannot do it.

ABSOLUTE NON-CO-OPERATION IMPOSSIBLE

It may truly be said that you cannot carry on even your physical life if you refuse to absolutely co-operate with the Government. When you go to buy your food you support the Government by using its currency and its credit. So we are not such fools as to say or to mean that absolute Non-Co-operation is possible or is our programme. What we mean is we must not help the administrative machine.

voluntary efforts, so far as we may do so, and thereby prolong its life. That is what I mean by Non-Co-operation. Non-Co-operation is withdrawing support from the Government. What shape or form this Non-Co-operation will take, cannot be determined for all time, for all men and for all the Provinces by one man or, by any one community or Province. The practical shape of Non-Co-operation will have to be determined by practical considerations. It may take one shape in the Punjab, another shape in Bengal. But what I want is this, that you, gentlemen, should ponder over the present situation and should consider whether there is any other weapon available to you to win your national freedom except this weapon of what is called Non-Co-operation. I would prefer my old familiar word, "passive resistance" Bengal understands passive resistance. Non-Co-operation is a new word to us, but it is the more harmless word. Passive resistance frightens some people, both friends and foes. Non-Co-operation possibly does not frighten the timid and does not also outrage the feelings of the virtuous (laughter). I think that is the virtue of Non-Co-operation. What they call Non-Co-operation is what we call passive resistance. Passive resistance means that we must resist the administration by forcing the administrators to do everything themselves and not have things done for them by us. That was our old passive resistance movement. But the new movement must be different from what the old passive resistance

TITLES AND GOVERNMENT SERVICE. 11.11.11

Now, Mr. Gandhi has proposed four stages of Non-Co-operation. Personally, I do not accept these four stages. I do not believe that those stages are workable. I do not believe that a large number of people will renounce their titles. They will not. But what we can do, I have already indicated. We should not recognise them (applause). That will take away the real value of these titles (laughter). Why does so much honour centre around a Rai Bahadur? Because a Rai Bahadur is believed to stand above others in the social scale. Why does the poor zemindar hanker after becoming a Raja? Because he thinks a mere zemindar is a nonentity, a Raja is a Durbari and a Raja gets more honour from society. Why do people hanker after the insignia of knighthood? Because it lifts them up to the seat of the mighty. Now, who makes them mighty? It is those who accept them as leaders of society? The man who was an ordinary man before he got his knighthood, as soon as he is invested with the insignia of his order—whatever his ability, whatever his character—comes and takes the chair for me at public meetings. These are the things which indicate the value of these titles; and it depends on you to say whether you should assign these values to these titles or not. If you refuse to recognise these titles their social value is reduced. Fifteen years ago, by repudiating the social value of these titles you worked a depreciation lower even than the depreciation

the Collector's office had more social honour in those days than a zemindar with Rs 20,000 a year. There is still some social honour in Government service. It depends on you and me to depreciate the value of Government service in this way. Reduce it to its own proper proportion of money value. In our ancient scriptures it is said that a Brahmin may not take food cooked or touched by a non-Brahmin, but that in time of famine, a Brahmin may accept such food. Go and serve the Government but remember yourself and we will always remind you of it that you are simply observing a dire and evil necessity.

OTHER FORMS OF NON-CO-OPERATION.

But there are other ways of Non-Co-operation. Why should we boycott Government service only? Why should we stop all association with Government only? The Government is not the British official only. The Government has two parts, one is the Anglo-Indian exploiter, the other is the Anglo-Indian administrator. On one side is the administrator, on the other side is the exploiter. Non-Co-operation with the administrator to the extent that it may be possible; Non-Co-operation with the exploiter to a much fuller extent than may be possible with the administrator (applause), that ought to be your campaign. Non-Co-operation with those who on the slightest provocation or without any provocation bring out their tiger claws, Non-Co-operation with men who do not even respect the dignity of the Council chamber but, standing before the Governor of the

day in the Bengal Council? It will do their bodies a little good instead of riding in motor cars they will have to rub and scrub. It will do their souls good to cook for and feed their own children. It will do their spirit good to be reduced to a lower scale of humanity and to know that they are equal to the meanest Khanshama or bearer.

ECONOMIC BOYCOTT.

That is one phase of Non-Co-operation. Economic Boycott is another. Why should we sell and buy of these foreign exploiters of our country? Why should we barter our goods with the goods of these gentlemen? If you starve exploitation, administration will become weak; if you starve exploitation, administration will become reasonable; if you starve exploitation, administration will become helpless. Who supports the administration? The big exploiters? Who supports exploitation? The Administrator.

What was the meaning of the Panjab atrocities of last year? We know that there were murders of some Europeans at Amritsar, and destruction of some European property. We all deplore these outrages. But we cannot refuse to recognise that the mob had been wantonly provoked to so woefully lose themselves in a sudden fit of frenzy. This provocation came from the Military who fired on an unarmed and inoffensive crowd who wanted simply to go and see the Deputy Commissioner to ask for the release of their leaders. But though they committed those outrages in a sudden fit of frenzy, and

under very grave provocation, we do not condone those outrages ; but we ask, were these any justification for the atrocities that followed as a retribution for those outrages ? "For every European life a thousand Indian lives will be taken"—a European official is reported to have publicly declared. "You and your children will have to pay for the evil done", was the open threat held out by the Deputy Commissioner of Amritsar. What do these mean ? Why is the life of a European more valuable in India than the life of an Indian ? The reason is this. These Europeans have to live in far away places in the prosecution of their business and they have to employ the Indians about them in this business and lord it over them ; and unless special protection is given them this economic and commercial exploitation cannot go on for a single day in the way that it has been going on for years and years past. The prestige of the British colour must therefore be maintained. The person and property of these European exploiters must be held especially sacred and the people of the country must be made to respect these almost as the Government itself. It was for this reason that the murder of five Europeans in Amritsar by a frenzied Indian mob led to all the things that General Dyer did. That is the real inwardness of the Punjab episode. That was the real meaning of the Jallianwala Bagh massacre". That was the true significance of the "Crawling Order" They talk of the attack on Miss Sherwood. It was not an indecent attack. It was an ordinary assault by a mad mob. It was no dishonour to her. Yet they have raised this cry of the protection of

their women and the safety of the honour of their wives and daughters. That is only a plea to protect the person and property of the European exploiter in this country.

THE HONOUR OF OUR WOMEN.

Have our women no honour ? No Indian outraged the honour of any Englishwoman, not even in the mob outburst in Amritsar although it was in a frenzied mind, not cruel deliberately. But how many poor Indian women, how many coolie women, how many passengers on our own Railways have been dishonoured ? We did not murmur, we did not try to raise the standard of revolt for we had come to look upon these things as exceptions due to the common impulse of a carnal nature. Why do you not look upon the assault committed upon the European woman Miss Sherwood in Amritsar as an outbreak of mob frenzy ? Why cannot you look upon it as an outbreak of criminal frenzy in a people whose comrades had been murdered by the soldiers ? Talk about defending the honour of your women. How did you take the reprisals in Minianwalla ? Colonel Smith when he visited Minianwala in the Gujrat District, having sent all the male population away, came to the village, entered the lanes, asked all the women to come out ; those who would not come out he pushed with his own stick (cries of shame).—For good ness' sake, give up this habit of crying shame. Think of it, nurse it, dream of it by night and think of it by day. This is not to cry shame on. Do not waste your energy by these effusive sentimentalisms. Deepen your sentiment,

strengthen your resolve to work the emancipation of your country from these things which are yet possible. Colonel Bosworth Smith went from house to house, called the women out—many of them purdanashins—those who would not come out he forced out with his stick asked them to take off their veils and those who refused to do so he took off their veils. Is this honouring our women? Then he called them by pushing these off with his stick and said ‘when you were sleeping with your husbands why did you allow them to go away?’ Can any man talk in this language to any woman let alone a gentleman? But we are not men or women. We are beasts. That is the correct characterisation of us in the lexicon, in the mind and thought of the class whom Colonel Smith represents. We are dogs, our women are bitches. It is said that in Amritsar British soldiers went and became naked before the windows of Sikh, Jat and Mohommadan women. What do you say to that? The protection of the honour of your women? Who protects who will protect the honour of thy women?

WHAT HAPPENED IN THE PUNJAB,
MAY HAPPEN IN BENGAL

When you look upon these things, when you consider what happened in the Punjab, can you understand that what happened in the Punjab last year may happen, if the occasion arises, next year in the United Provinces? Who knows that it may not even happen in Bengal? I said that they did not

dare to do these things in Bengal fifteen years ago. But if Bengal changes, if Bengal becomes reasonable, if Bengal becomes sane, then who knows that what happened at Lahore, at Amritsar and at Manianwalla in 1919 may not happen at Dacca, at Comilla, at Calcutta and at Mymensing in 1925, or 1930 ? Is there any guarantee ? Why did not these things happen in Bengal in 1905 and 1906 ? Because Bengal had a backbone then, because Bengal had certainly developed a vertebra then, because Bengal had certainly become extremist then, because Bengal stood up with deathless determination in those days and stood no nonsense either from Government or anybody else. That is why the thing was impossible in Bengal in those days. But if Bengal becomes sane, consider this is practicable or impracticable—the question of practicability or impracticability I put out of court at once—because desperate diseases call for desperate remedies and when people are driven to extreme helplessness. They cannot consider what is practicable and what is not practicable, but they must make the impracticable practicable. If Bengal stops to consider these things, then rest assured the fate of the Punjab will overtake you also some day. Those who tried to save their skin in 1906-7 lost it woefully dishonourably in 1919. If you seek to save it to-day, you will lose it to-morrow. It is therefore that I say that we have no alternative except this Non-Co-operation to make an honest effort for the solution of the problem of national emancipation in India.

THE WAY TO FREEDOM

There are only three ways of obtaining national freedom. One is the way of revolution. The other is the way of open rebellion. The third is Passive Resistance. The way of armed conflict is barred to us by outer circumstances and our inner responsibilities for reasonably securing of our own future and the peace of the world. Armed revolt is precluded from our programme because in the first place we have not the materials for successful armed conflict and because in the second place even if we had them we must try every possible means of peaceful compromise and reconciliation before resorting to brute force. Sri Krishna did it. We have not forgotten that episode. He knew that the Kurus would not accept the offer of the Pandavas. Sri Krishna said 'Let me try the way of peace, let me go and give the message of peace to the enemy. He did so and his offer was rejected and then and not till then was a Dharma yuddha or the war of Righteousness declared, not before then. We have not the wherewith to oppose by physical might the might of the British. Even if we had that, our higher humanity, our higher civilisation, our wonderful outlook of men and the world, our lofty ideals of peace and good will though they would not absolutely prohibit, would restrain us a hundred times before we took that fatal step. But it is not within the range of practical politics and we need not discuss it. That being out of the question what can you do now? The only thing

is to sit quiet and give up the struggle. Are you willing to give it up (cries of no) ! the next thing is to wait on the pleasure, the generosity, the sympathy of the British Cabinet and the British Parliament (cries of no). You cannot wait upon that either. What then can you do ? Non-Co-operation is the only weapon left you to fight for your national freedom. I have already said that what shape this Non-Co-operation will take cannot be decided upon yet. It will have to be decided by each Province for itself. It is a game of chess. Politics is a game of chess and you will have to put forward your own pawn or your queen or your castle according to the move made by your opponent. Let us see if the Congress will set its seal upon the legality and constitutional character of the campaign of Non-Co-operation and upon the fact that this is our only weapon and, that this is our last chance. Upon this let us see what the Government will do.

DO NOT REPEAT THE MISTAKE OF 1906-1908.

Gentlemen, I have one word further to tell you about it and that is this. The last time in 1906 and 1907 the country suffered. Why did it suffer ? Why did Bengal suffer ? Why did our young men in their thousands suffer ? Why did a number of our young men go underground and commence to work for revolutionary ends ? Who is responsible for it ? We are responsible for it. We divided the country. One party went away from another party. One party went at the back of the authorities. If that party had not sided

authorities—however moderately, with whatever reservation it may be—if that party had not convened public meetings to decry the more advanced party if they had not made loyal proclamations if they had not with trembling of heart and with a view to save their skins repudiated all sympathy with the more advanced politicians, then the history of the Minto regime would have been very differently written. That which was throbbing in 1906 before the Congress of that year, in the political and administrative atmosphere of India is throbbing also again to day on the eve of the special Congress of 1920. And if you gentlemen, if our Moderate friends will come and join this Congress not to deflect it from its deliberation to take up non co-operation but to stand by it in the hour of trial that is coming on (applause) all will be well. Mr Montagu has already raised his big stick. He has already said that the Government of India and the local Governments have been given a blank card to deal with whatever situation may arise through Mr Gandhis campaign of non co operation. They are holding their hands. Why, do you know? They are waiting the decision of the Congress. If

I beseech them, I pray to them in the name of our common Mother (applause) to come but not to oppose this campaign of non-co-operation. It is the inspiration of Providence. The whole of India sees it. Do not oppose it. Opposition to non-co operation means support to official repression. Let it be clearly understood that whoever in the press or on the platform opposes non-co-operation, lends so much strength to the bureaucracy already eager to crush it with iron knuckles and beat down non-co-operation to the ground. And what happened in 1906 and 1907 will happen again. The movement went underground in Bengal. Let the authorities take note that passive resistance or the non-co-operation movement which possessed Bengal alone in 1906, 1907 and 1908 has become an all-India movement to-day and it will be the height of suicidal folly on the part of Anglo-Indian politicians and British statesmen to do anything that may direct the energy, the enthusiasm, the deathless determination, the spirit of self-sacrifice that this cry of non-co-operation has evoked in the country into unhealthy, and unconstitutional channels. Take your lesson from the past. Non-co-operation or passive resistance in 1907 and 1908 failed because repression drove a number of ardent and impatient young men to secret political propaganda. That was their mistake. The

So I appeal to every party, every individual leader, to stand by the people in the hour of their need. In a country like ours there can be no parties, except two parties—one the party of the Government and the other the party of the people (cries of hear, hear). There can be no third party. These who are not with the people are against the people. We have come to the evening of our lives. We may pass our days in peace, possibly even in so-called honour, but what about our sons? The spirit of national freedom once quickened in a people never dies unless that freedom is attained or the nation itself dies in the attempt. I may temporise. My son will not. Even if he did my grandsons will not, and they will pay the penalty of my temporising by suffering greater repression, by paying a greater price for this freedom which I might buy for a comparatively small price.

NON-CO-OPERATION.

(SECOND LECTURE)

On the last occasion, in the Indian Association Hall, I tried, as far as I could, to place before you the situation in India as well as outside India which affects us very vitally. I tried to point out, in the first place,—that was my first premise—that the Government of India is essentially of the nature of a military occupation (hear, hear). That was my first premise and I established it by a reference, among other things, to the Punjab atrocities of last year; and that being so, I considered the situation in India, as a military occupation by a very small number of foreign soldiers but supported by a very large number of Indian Sepoys and policemen. That is, to my mind, the real character of the Government of Britain in India at the present time. And I tried to point out, in the next place, that owing to circumstances with which you are all familiar, the ground of recruitment for the Indian mercenary troops has been very much narrowed during the last few years. The Punjab was about the largest recruiting field, and we all know it will be difficult to have a large number of recruits from the Punjab after what happened there last year. The next recruiting field was the trans-frontier Mahomedan Province or Provinces. And the Turkish policy of the Government has considerably diminished the possibilities of recruitment there also. My second premise, therefore, was the narrowing down

this military domination For long years past, we had been looking forward to this development when the present Government would realise its physical weakness, and realising this, would try to reconcile the interests of the Empire with the interests of India That was our one hope of reconciliation But looking abroad and considering the world situation now, we find a new menace to India's future freedom and a new obstacle in the way of the reconciliation of the legitimate interests of Indian Nationalism with the reasonable requirements of the integrity of the present British Empire A menace to this has appeared in the new acquisitions of British Military Imperialism in Africa That was my third premise on the last occasion And I said that in view of this new menace which would take at least ten years, or not very much more than ten years, to fully materialise, it became imperative that we must make a heroic attempt to win complete National autonomy within this period These, gentlemen, were my premises and my conclusion from these premises was that Non Co operation was our only weapon and this was our last chance (loud applause)

THE BEN ALI & THE FIONEER

Now, I have referred to these, because I found last Saturday morning the "Bengalee" making the declaration that it did not accept my premises and entirely differed from my conclusions Now, the soul of my premise is, the new menace

from Africa. The "Bengalee" might not accept my premise but there are others who have been a little troubled by this presentation of the subject. The "Pioneer" of Sunday last came out with a very significant paragraph which I would read out to you and which, to my mind, while abusing me—calling me a hair-brained politician—still in the main supports my position. This is what the "Pioneer" writes:—"Mr. Bipin Chandra Pal who once delivered himself of the celebrated dictum that there are no anarchists in Bengal—only evolutionary patriots—has started a new scare in the hope of giving a fillip to the Non-Co-operation movement. It appeared that according to this enlightening exposition of political extremism, Non-co operation is to be regarded as absolutely the last chance for the Indians and even of winning their national freedom. India must obtain freedom, by which we suppose, it means—complete Swaraj within the next ten years, otherwise, the alien oppressors will have time to organise and equip hordes of African tribes and bring them over to India for the purpose of holding India in subjection indefinitely. It is of course generally known that it was the avowed intention of Germany, (mark these words) if she won the war, to draw on Africa's illimitable store of manhood with the object of establishing a German super-state ruling over a congeries of slave states."

Gentlemen, this is exactly—not in such fine English but in plainer language—what I told you the

and I think the "Pioneer," without meaning it, really supports my contention. The "Pioneer" admits that it was generally known that Germany, if she had won the war would have organised and equipped the illimitable man-power of Africa with a view to establish a super-state over a congeries of slave-states. Now, if Germany wanted to do it, why cannot Great Britain, placed in the same position—desire to follow in its wake? They are both Teutons—the Anglo-Saxons came from the other side of the channel—racially they are one; and they have both been out for world-domination, for world-exploitation. And the real cause of the German war was that England had left no room for the expansion of German Imperialism and the satisfaction of German ambition. That was the real root of the last war. Gentlemen, my main premise is thus admitted by the "Pioneer."

NO RACE-HATRED.

I should like to add only one word of comment to what the "Pioneer" has said and it is in reference to race-hatred which it has raised. I have absolutely no hatred of any race. I do not hate the British. I cannot hate the British. I have, I think, as many friends among Englishmen and women at "home" as many of the writers in the Anglo-Indian journals. As a nation I have nothing to say against them. My fight is not with the English people, my fight is not with the individual English, my fight is with British Imperialist policy (hear, hear). And if such a policy had

been started in India, if our own people had tried carry out such a policy of Imperialist expansion exploitation, my pen and my voice, and all the strength that God has given me, would have risen in revolt against it as it has risen in revolt against the British Imperialists. There is no question of race hatred here. The 'Pioneer' wants to draw a red herring across our path. With all the emphasis I can command I say that in my writings, in my speeches in my public life and in my private conversation never have I preached racial ill feeling, and that none can accuse me of race hatred or of race partiality. On the other hand I have little love for the British bureaucracy.

5J SATYENDRA PRASANNA SINHA'S APPOINTMENT

You have heard Srijut Satyendra Prasanna Sinha (I do not recognise him as Lord (hear, hear), I do not know a better title than Srijut) Satyendra Prasanna Sinha has been appointed to be the first Governor under the new Montagu Act in Behar. I have raised my voice against it in the 'Independent'. This has surprised many of my friends including the 'Bengalee' and the 'Englishman'. The 'Bengalee' is surprised at it and calls it contemptible and yet devotes more than a column of its valuable space to discuss this contemptible thing and has quoted the whole of the contemptible article of the 'Independent' of yesterday morning. I consider this appointment as a new menace to our freedom. How? Because

this appointment will decoy good many of our ardent patriots from the work that they have been doing hitherto. The position of a Provincial Governor may tempt even the gods (laughter) and I shall not be surprised if this appointment, as I said, lures away a fair percentage of our own workers from the Nationalist to the Government side. We have nothing to offer except prison. We have nothing to offer except calumny. We have nothing to offer except poverty. We have nothing to offer except the sacrifice that the Mother demands of every worker (hear, hear). We have nothing more to offer. On the other side, there are great allurements of high offices, big briefs, culminating in the Governorship of a province, some day possibly, even in the position of the Viceroy. Why then should we rejoice? I do not rejoice at it. What reason have we to believe that a Bengali Governor will make a better ruler than an Englishman? I do not believe it. Man to man, there is no difference between an English official and a Bengali official. On the other hand, the Bengali official must necessarily be the weaker man of the two (hear, hear). The Englishman knows—the Englishman ruling a province knows, that he stands there in his own right. The Bengali appointed to be the ruler of a province will never be able to forget that he has got it as his reward for the services done to the alien Bureaucracy (hear, hear). An Englishman knows that if he tries to do the right and even if his superior official does not approve of it, he will have the approbation of his own conscience. And he will

have a certain number at least of his colleagues who may approve of his conduct, he will not only have the approbation of his own countrymen here but also across the seas at his back. Even General Dyer is supported by practically the whole of the European and Anglo Indian community (shame, shame), even General Dyer is practically supported by the Government of India and by the British Cabinet (loud cries of shame). He has been practically supported, not in his excesses not in his indiscretions not in the indecent way in which he discharged his duties but he is supported in the general policy and the fidelity to duty which he has been credited with. Can you conceive of an Indian Governor doing what he thought to be right, receiving the support of the officials here even if he goes against the official policy or of the Anglo Indians here if he hurts their interest? And as for your support and my support, these do not count in the least. Every Indian appointed to such a high position, knows it that he is in the nature of an experiment. He further knows that he is on his trial and the success of the experiment will be measured by his capacity to fit himself in the particular place of the official machine where he has been put (hear, hear). That is the success of the experiment. The success of the experiment will be measured and determined by his capacity not to create inconvenient situations, but by his capacity to pull on well with his Anglo Indian and British
 —, —, — And under these circumstances, human nature

being what it is, I do not believe that an Indian placed in such a high position can discharge his duties as conscientiously, as honestly, as fearlessly of all consequences, as many an English bureaucrat has done and will be able to do. I do not think that even Srijiut Satyendra Prasanna Sinha will be able to stand up like the late Sir Henry Cotton against the Government of India. Sir Henry stood up against Lord Curzon's policy in regard to the Assam Tea Garden labour (hear, hear.) I do not think—I shall be surprised if—an Indian Governor, taking his appointment as in the nature of an experiment, will have the courage to do what Sir Henry did. Srijiut Satyendra Prasanna Sinha is the father of the Press Act (shame, shame). Did he stand up for the rights of his people as Law Member when he held that position? And after what he did in regard to the Press Act, we have no reason to expect that he will not act similarly in regard to other matters that may be called for from him, in the interest of the fundamental policy of the British Bureaucracy in India. One swallow does not make a summer; and even two hundred Sinhas occupying every high place in the Administration will not make the Administration in India National. It will be 'bureaucratic. And we Nationalists have always declared that we do not want a Brown Bureaucracy in place of the present White Bureaucracy. On the contrary, if we are to have a Bureaucracy at all, it is preferable that we should have an alien Bureaucracy without any rights in the country, without the thousand and one subtle

social influences which each one of us exerts and to which each one of us is subject as a native of this country. Considering all these things, I believe that Englishmen, foreigners and aliens rather should be made to rule our provinces than Indians imported from one province into another until Indian constituencies are able to control the Indian Executive. Therefore I say that we are not out for participating in the loaves and fishes of office. The situation being, as I tried to explain the other day so critical, you must, if you are ever to attain your freedom, win it before the present British military imperialism has had time to organise and train and equip the illimitable man power to quote the Pioneer, of the African Continent with a view to keep us in physical subjection.

HOW TO WIN OUR FREEDOM ARMED REVOLT ?

Now the question is how can we achieve it. The first thing that may occur to thoughtless and reckless people is armed revolt. This is out of the question. We have not the materials for an armed revolt, and even if we had them no sane Indian politician would for a single moment lend his support to the very idea of it. And I will tell you why. An armed revolt even where it succeeds necessarily establishes in the transition period a military despotism over the people. You cannot succeed in an armed revolt without bringing in the train of your success military despotism. That was the same in France that has been the same in other parts of the world. It was not the same in America.

and the reason was this, that in America the civic life of the people had been fully organised, the municipal and other local self-governing institutions had received a degree of perfection not existing at that time even in the United Kingdom itself. It was owing to the fact that America had powerful municipal and other institutions of self-government, it was because of the fact that America had a national militia composed of the various provincial or State militia, as they came to be called later on—and because the American War of Independence was a very small affair after all—it was because of this that an armed revolt succeeded in establishing national independence without military autocracy or despotism in the United States. But you have no civic organisation in India ; you have no militia of your own in the districts. Therefore any armed revolt will necessarily depend upon the organisation of a huge army—not a national army in the true sense, that is, an army subject to national control, but an army controlled by some capable general, and when that general succeeds in the revolt it is not likely that he will give it up to you as a free gift. It is not likely that his officers, once tasting power, will renounce it in your favour. It is not at all likely that the military will ever give up their supreme control of your national affairs and your national assemblies. It has never happened anywhere. Then it is not because of the want of materials merely but also out of considerations of high statemanship and, above all, from considerations of our ethical and our

spiritual culture that we cannot lend our support to any idea of military revolt.

SECRET REVOLUTION.

The next is secret revolutionary propaganda. But that is fatal to the moral life of the nation and the spirit of freedom in the people. Secret revolutionary propaganda starts with terrorism, feeds on terrorism and lives by terrorism, and by seeking to terrorise the Administration ends by terrorising the people, and the demoralisation of the Government follows at the same time with the demoralisation of the people. Secret revolutionary propaganda therefore can never succeed in our endeavour to attain national freedom. And if it succeeds at all, it must succeed through an open armed revolt and the objection against armed revolt, applies equally against secret political criminalism as a means for the attainment of national freedom.

CONSTITUTIONAL AGITATION OUT OF THE QUESTION

What then have we to do? Constitutional agitation! It is an old word. But, as we have been saying for the last 15 years, there can be no constitutional agitation except in a country which is subject to a constitutional government (hear, hear)—and a constitutional government is not an autocracy, not an irresponsible bureaucracy. Our government is not a constitutional government. In a constitutional government public opinion rules the policy of the State. In India the policy of the autocracy is not controlled, by a jot or a title, by

the opinion of the people of the country. And our Government not being a constitutional one, not being subject to a constitutional State authority, constitutional agitation in India is a meaningless thing. It means, what Mr. Ashutosh Chowdhury, before he was raised to the High court Bench, many years ago declared, political mendicancy. And political mendicancy never wins freedom. It may get—as mendicancy always does—a few little crumbs from the Bureaucratic table, even big slices of bread or mutton, it may be,—but it never gets the mastery of one's own house (hear, hear). It remains always in the position of a dependent and a slave as it always was. Constitutional agitation is therefore out of the question.

BRITISH IMPERIALISM AND INDIAN FREEDOM

In the next place, shall we wait upon the pleasure of the British people and the British Parliament for the attainment of our freedom? No Sir. The British Imperialist policy, if you know it, if you know the inwardness of it—you will understand, does not contemplate a future—within a conceivable distance—when India shall be a free nation among the free nations of the world. Mr. Montagu calls us a partner nation. We are a partner nation. In the days of my boyhood, we had—in Eastern Bengal, in any case, in my own district—remnants of our old slave system. In my own family we had one who might be called a slave. He was treated and looked upon as one of the most important members of the family. But for all that he was not the son of the house—the son of the

of the Government (shame, shame)—one was the Maharaja of Bikaner and the other was Srijiut Satyendra Prasanna Sinha. There was also an Imperial Conference convened about the same time. The Imperial War Cabinet and the Imperial Conference the two bodies, one meeting with the Prime Minister, Mr. Lloyd George as its President and the other sitting with the Colonial Secretary, Mr. Walter Long—and I believe he was then the Colonial Secretary—as its president—both these conferences, these Imperial gatherings considered the question of the reconstruction of the Empire. They placed on record that the Dominions are self-governing Sovereign States inside the Empire and India is an important part of the Empire. Mark the distinction; the first paragraph was that the Dominions are self-governing Sovereign States within the Empire and the second paragraph is that India is an important part thereof. And what was the Imperial Conference doing of which Srijiut Satyendra Prasanna Sinha was a member? It said that the problem of Imperial reconstruction must be left for future consideration and treatment. In the meanwhile it should be considered whether Imperial Preference in trade relations might not be established between India and the self-governing Colonies of Great Britain. It declared, gentlemen, that the time for political reconstruction had not come but the time was ripe for economic reconstruction (shame, shame) with a view to the better exploitation of the natural resources and the cheap labour of this dependency.

house was myself—for all that he was a slave, but a partner in the family commonwealth. He was a partner—my father gave him in marriage, fed him clothed him and his wife and children. My father gave his daughter in marriage. My father treated him and his family all along kindly and considerately and looked upon him as his own son. Sympathy he had, kindness he had more than he could desire even from his parents. But for all that he was a slave, at the most a slave partner in the family commonwealth. Wealth and office and rank we may have if Mr Montagu's great heart's desire is fulfilled (laughter). But we shall be partners in the British Commonwealth of the class and type to which my father's born slave was a partner in my family commonwealth (hear hear). Mr. Montagu says that we shall gradually become equal partners in the Empire. But how long will it take? Mr Montagu does not—dares not—tell us that. There was a question of reconstruction of the Empire after the war. And we thought that when the war was over, there was going to be a reconstruction of the Empire and we were going to be admitted into equal partnership with the other members of the British Commonwealth. The war is now over. During the progress of the war the British Coalition Cabinet invited the Prime Ministers of the different overseas Dominions to join it to form an Imperial War Cabinet and—in that Cabinet two Indians were also invited—not Premiers of India—not the chosen representative of the people, but the faithful servants and friends.

of the British Empire would largely depend upon the line of evolution that the non-British peoples within the Empire might take in the future. And the writers said we know the white races of the Empire, we know what they are. They belong to our race, they belong to our civilisation. They are proud to call themselves *Britains across the seas*. But it is not applicable to those peoples in the Empire who are not of British or predominantly British descent. This cannot be said of Egypt or Rajputana, to quote their own words—not Egypt or India.

AN ALLIANCE OF DIS-SIMILARS.

Bengal ! Do you understand the significance of the statement ? Egypt and India usually convey the impression to the readers that India is a homogeneous country, that it is a nation, that it has elements of nationhood ; and therefore the clever writer says Egypt or Rajputana or Bengal ; and he says that he does not know what line of evolution Egypt, Rajputana or Bengal would take in the coming years—whether gradually these will closely approach to their own type, so that after some time they will be able to assimilate them into their own commonwealth, just as they have assimilated Canada and South Africa, or whether these would develop such widely divergent tendencies, that the reconstruction will have to follow the line of alliance of dissimilars. Just mark these things. This line of evolution will take years and years—perhaps it will take centuries to fully develop itself and indi-

BRITISH IMPERIALIST IDEA

Our Moderate friends will not seize the inwardness of it unless they know something more. Eleven years ago, in 1908, a remarkable article was published in the 'Times' in its Empire Day edition. In that article the 'Times' clearly pointed out the line of Imperialist evolution. In that article, the 'Times' declared that the British Empire was not one but two and the two was one. The British Empire were two Empires joined in one. One Empire was the self governing Empire consisting of Great Britain and the self governing Dominions. The other was the dependent Empire, composed of India, the Crown Colonies and the Protectorates. And the Self governing Empire was invited to gradually enter into partnership with the United Kingdom in the government and the economic development of the Dependent Empire. That was in 1908 and we find practically a reiteration, re interpretation and re presentation of that Imperialist policy to day. The inspiration of it came from Lord Milner. We see the re iteration and re representation of the same policy in the conclusion of the Imperial Conference of which Srijut Satyendra Prasanna Sinha was one of the representatives of India. During the time of the War they were all talking and thinking of Imperial reconstruction. A series of articles appeared in the 'Times' on Imperial Reconstruction and in these articles it was clearly laid down that the future

motive, the inner objective and the inner idea of this much-talked-of reform is absolutely the same as of this British Imperialism to which expression was given in the columns of the "Times" during the progress of the last war. The Montagu Act, we have been told—even this morning—we are hearing it every morning from Keranibagan-Bowbazaar—that the Montagu Act is the gospel of our salvation, that the new Reform Act will bring us all that we desire. But we know what these reforms are. I will, however, tell you what the reforms strike an outsider,—from a letter which has appeared in the "Democrat", a letter from an American friend of mine, well-known in the United States, well-known in Canada as a minister of religion, well-known in England also as a preacher of liberal religion who had come to India twice and had met me on both those occasions in India. I met him once in London also. And he writes to me from New York:—

"I generally like the position you take in Indian affairs, and toward Great Britain, and now particularly toward the New Government of India Act. As I see it, the damning thing about that Act is it does not concede that India has any rights; it is the voice of a master to a slave; because England possesses the power therefore she may do what she pleases; there is nothing mutual about it; it is a thing dictated by one party upon the other; therefore it is a thing that India can accept only on her knees. It seems to me India should say to England:

cate its own nature and its coming trend and tendencies and until that is done,—until Egypt, Rajputana and Bengal have satisfied the British Imperialist that they can be assimilated to the great Anglo Saxon stock or until they develop tendencies so distinctly their own that the question may arise whether to keep them within the Empire, some scheme or schemes will have to be devised to form an alliance of dissimilars. In either case it will take long, long years longer than 25 30 or 50 years to indicate our future line of evolution. But what about the present? The Imperialists say, in the meantime, the existing order must be continued. Mark, in the meantime the existing order must be continued. In the meantime the idea that they hold Egypt, Rajputana and Bengal as a Trustee must be sedulously cherished by the British and must be encouraged and cultivated among Egyptians, Rajputs and Bengalees. So Egypt, Rajputana and Bengal these are their trusts and must be maintained as such during this period until they have developed either the British line of evolution, until they have proved whether they can be Englishmen or they must be something different from Englishmen with a view to form some scheme of alliance of dissimilars. This will take years and years.

THE VOICE OF A MASTER TO A SLAVE

And if you read carefully the Montagu Chelmsford Report—if you read carefully the Montagu Reform Act, you will find that the inner spirit, the inner

He never came to the Moslem League. He never saw with his own eyes or heard with his own ears what the united voice of India wanted. He came and he consulted the Government of India and he went and drafted a Bill and a Joint Committee of the two Houses of Parliament considered that Bill and passed it. We were not represented in the framing of the Bill. Our opinions were taken as evidences of outsiders. We were not consulted in a matter concerning us. It is imposed upon us by them and the objective of this Act is to prolong the life of the present Bureaucracy (hear, hear) and to prolong our present political and economic serfdom. That is the object of this Act. You can as quickly, as effectively draw sunshine out of cucumber, but, as it is, you cannot gain national freedom by working out this Montagu lollypop. You may get a few ministerships, but you cannot have freedom. Freedom is bred upon the rights of a people to defend its borders, as I said on the last occasion, and the Montagu Act does not contemplate even as a distant possibility the transference of the control of the military and the defence of the people of India to their own control. The Montagu-Chelmsford Report clearly said, I referred to it on the last occasion, that it is inconceivable that the last remaining connection between India and England will be the presence of British soldiers. We do not want them. We do not want the British soldiers because the British soldiers are there to keep the British civilians in power. We saw it in

"This is our country it is not yours You have no right to be in India, except the right of the sword, and that is no right But as a fact you are here and for a time at least we must live together, therefore let us together form a plan for carrying on the Government which will insure peace, and which will be as fair and just as possible to both parties To this end let a Commission be appointed by you and another by us, and together let the Joint Commission work out a Scheme of Government Reform Such an arrangement will be just and fair Nothing short of such an arrangement will India accept Nothing short of these ought England to ask or desire us to accept"

Now this is what an American,—Doctor J T Sunderland a renowned American publicist and minister of religion, whose love of India and whose love of human freedom and international peace and fellowship has compelled him in his present age after his retirement from the pulpit to take charge of our organ in New York—the Young India He is now the editor of Young India taking the place left vacant by Lala Lajpat Rai (loud cheers) on his coming back to India And Dr Sunderland writes in this strain to me I think Dr Sunderland has put the whole case in regard to the Montagu Act in a nutshell We had no part or lot in the framing of this Act Mr Montagu came, he saw, he slept, he talked with the Viceroy, he held interviews with Indian politicians and publicists He never consulted people He never came to the National Congress

that does not threaten the safety of the Empire, to give the nation every chance and every opportunity that is not plainly mischievous"—which means that which does not threaten the interests of British Capital and British Commerce and the British ruling class or caste—and if the "native" does anything which is likely to hurt the power and prestige and position of the bureaucracy, these agitations must be put down by lawless laws and the executive lawlessness (shame, shame).

Therefore I say, we cannot expect to win national freedom as even an equal partner in the British Commonwealth of nations by means of this Montagu Act, even if we wait till the Greek calends. We may get Mr. Montagu as the Viceroy—he will make an excellent Viceroy, many of our friends will go and have beautiful dinners at the Government House at Simla or Delhi, they will have ample opportunities of securing appointments for their flesh and blood and their flesh and blood and their flesh and blood, (laughter). They will have ample opportunities even of carrying tales against the hated Extremists to the Viceregal ears. They will have opportunities of instigating repression against their political opponents. These they will have. But even with Mr. Montagu as Viceroy, they will not be able to bring us our freedom. Nay, not even with the magic wand of the Poet Laureate of Asia will Mr. Montagu be able to give us our freedom. No, gentlemen, these will not attain our freedom. These will not bring us the succour

the Punjab. Dyer was there to maintain the prestige of O'Dwyer. That was the whole thing. We want to defend our own borders ourselves. But you first deprive us of the right of self-defence; you took away from us our right to bear arms; you have emasculated us and now you put forward this fruit of your own policy, and action, as a reason for not allowing us this right. And now you say that, we are unable to defend ourselves and that, we are at the mercy, of every stranger that comes to our borders. We want only the right to organise ourselves, to train ourselves, to equip ourselves for the defence of our motherland. You won't give it. The Montagu Act does not contemplate it. It will not give us our national freedom.

SUMMING UP.

If armed revolt is out of the question, if revolutionary secret propaganda is out of the question,—if both are to be condemned as suicidal—if constitutional agitation is a myth, a delusion and a snare, if the Montagu Act makes no provision for transferring the right of defence of our country and if the inner policy of the British Military Imperialism is to prolong the present state of India's servitude—to encourage both in the rulers and the ruled the idea that they are here as our trustees and when we are able to take charge of our country it will be ours. If in the mean time they are to continue to rule over us, keep things going, to release every tendency

NON-CO-OPERATION.

ITS MEANING AND METHOD.

Swamiji* and friends : I have to speak in English as I have been doing in this series, because I want, if it is possible for me, to reach an audience not only outside Calcutta, but also outside Bengal.

I want not only my Bengali friends should consider my submissions but I want my Indian friends, my friends in the other provinces of India should kindly consider these submissions. And I want further ; I want those who are just now placed in authority over us to clearly understand what we are striving for, and how we propose, so far as it lies in our power and if it pleases God, to achieve our end. For these reasons, I will continue my speech in English. Just for one brief moment I will take those of you who were not present at my first lecture in the Indian Association Hall and also in the short lecture which, on account of the inclemency of weather I could not finish, which I delivered early last week in the Beadon Square. I want for a brief moment to carry them through my previous speeches.

RE-CAPITULATION.

In the first place, I hold that we must if we are to achieve—humanly speaking—National autonomy

* Swami Shradhdhanandji who was present, kindly took the chair at this meeting.

that we want. What then will bring it? As I said on the last occasion and I say once again—that Non-Co-operation (hear, hear) is the only thing which will lead us to our cherished goal. But what is Non-Co-operation? I think, I shall be unfit for any work if I do not stop here in this wet weather. Next day, I shall straight away start with this question—What is Non-Co-operation?—and will explain its significance

NON-CO-OPERATION.

ITS MEANING AND METHOD.

Swamiji* and friends : I have to speak in English as I have been doing in this series, because I want, if it is possible for me, to reach an audience not only outside Calcutta, but also outside Bengal.

I want not only my Bengali friends should consider my submissions but I want my Indian friends, my friends in the other provinces of India should kindly consider these submissions. And I want further ; I want those who are just now placed in authority over us to clearly understand what we are striving for, and how we propose, so far as it lies in our power and if it pleases God, to achieve our end. For these reasons, I will continue my speech in English. Just for one brief moment I will take those of you who were not present at my first lecture in the Indian Association Hall and also in the short lecture which, on account of the inclemency of weather I could not finish, which I delivered early last week in the Beadon Square. I want for a brief moment to carry them through my previous speeches.

RE-CAPITULATION.

In the first place, I hold that we must if we are to achieve—humanly speaking—National autonomy

* Swami Shraddhanandji who was present, kindly took the chair at this meeting.

or National freedom within any reasonable distance of time, we must make a heroic effort during the next ten years I believe that if we fail to attain our complete National autonomy that is, if we fail to secure full and complete control, not merely of our legislative machinery and our executive government but also of the instruments and organisations of national defence, if we cannot get full and unrestricted authority over our military policy and military organisation and over our police—during the next ten years, then so far as human intelligence can foresee humanly speaking, our fate and future will be sealed almost for ever. And my reason is this I hold that the present Government in India is government by physical force It is no doubt based upon the passive acquiescence of the people But for this passive acquiescence this Government or, for the matter of that, any Government cannot exist for a single moment in India or elsewhere (hear, hear) No doubt the present Government, as it happens with all Government the world over is supported by the passive acquiescence of the people This passive acquiescence, however, is being sought to be secured now by a show of military force That is my interpretation of what happened in Bengal during the early years of the present century That is the conviction that has been borne in upon me by the incidents of the Punjab last

The administration of martial law and the measures committed under it in the Punjab—were

irected to one definite end, viz. to reduce, I am
 uoting official language, to reduce the morale of
 he people; to bring them into a docile mood, to
 nduce a spirit of submission in the people by holding
 ut to them the threat of aeroplanes and of all other
 hings with which we have been made familiar in
 he Punjab. And the one lesson of the Punjab atro-
 ities is this, that the Government in this country is
 overnment through military occupation (shame, shame).
 There is no shame, my dear friends, in these things.
 Do not cry shame, as I said the other day. Take
 these things in and consider what these mean
 to you and to those who are coming after you.
 Now, this military domination is supported not by
 the handful of British soldiers in India, it is sup-
 ported by our own soldiers, it is supported by our
 own police, it is supported by the army of the
 people of India. You must recognise that. In that,
 as I said in my speech in the Indian Association
 Rooms, lay at one time our great hope for the future;
 because we knew that the time was coming, if it
 had not already come, when there would be an
 awakening in those classes who furnished recruits for
 the Army and the Police under the Government;
 and with this awakening would come a sense of duty;
 there would be an awakening not only of patriotism,
 not only of national consciousness, but an awakening
 of the individual conscience in these men, and the
 time would come, we thought, when at the dictate
 of their conscience they would refuse to terrorise

over their fellow countrymen at the command of their foreign masters (hear, hear) We were looking forward to that time But a new danger has appeared on the horizon and that danger is acquisition of extensive territory by British Military Imperialism in Africa The illimitable manpower I am quoting the Pioneer which tried to me — of Africa was sought to be organised, trained and equipped by the Germans with a view to establishing a Super-State ruling over a congeries of slave states This is what the 'Pioneer' admits and I think that was what German Military Imperialism wanted to do There is absolutely no reason to believe why British Military Imperialism will not try to do the same That is the new menace It is a physical menace and this menace makes it imperative on you and me to make a heroic effort to win complete National autonomy within the next ten years, the period within which it will be possible for British Military Imperialism that has come into the inheritance of German Military Imperialism to organise, to train and to equip this illimitable manpower in Africa Great Britain will be able to do this within these ten years and then as your soldiers had been taken to Abyssinia as they had been taken to Soudan, as they had been taken to Somaliland and are being taken even to day to Mesopotamia to hold that country under the heel of the British similarly the African hordes will be inevitably invited to come and help the

tary of State for India The Government of India is not responsible to anybody except to itself is to its own conscience And I was told by lawyer friend that conscience legally was described by high juridical authority as something which be measured by the length of the boots of presiding judge So the conscience of the Government of India can only be measured by the length of the boots of his Excellency the Viceroy and that is the thing to which the Government of India is responsible It is an irresponsible Government an autocratic Government—a Bureaucracy which owes no manner of responsibility to the people over which it rules Therefore, constitutional agitation is absolutely out of the question It is like the son of a barren woman

MONTAGU REFORM ACT

I read almost every morning in the Bengalee that there is salvation for India in the Montagu Act Behold the light of freedom bursting forth from White Hall in the form of this Great Act We shall achieve our freedom by the Montagu Act Well I will not discuss the Act now I will just remind you of this that the Montagu Act is not something apart from the general policy of the present day British Imperialism and that Imperialism does not conceive an ending of the subjection of India or at least an early ending of it This Imperialist policy says that the future of India must be determined by the course

of evolution that India takes. If India follows the line of evolution which the Overseas Dominions have taken which are proud to call themselves Britains, across the seas, that is, if India develops in the line of the evolution of Canada, Australia or New Zealand or South Africa, then there will be a real sort of union between India and other parts of the Empire, but if India develops along a different line, then the problem of the Empire will be how to form an alliance of dissimilars. Now, all these, gentlemen, will put off the day of our deliverance even within the British Empire to the Greek Calends. It will take centuries to discover whether you will be like the Boers, whether you will be like the French Canadians, whether you will be like the Maoris or whether you will be like the Australians. It will take centuries to discover whether your particular line of evolution will fit in with the general scheme of the British Empire, so that some form of constitution may be devised by which there will be an alliance of dissimilars. This evolution will not indicate its trends and tendencies within the next ten years and there can therefore be no Imperial reconstruction within this period which will raise India from its present status of a dependent to that of a partner nation. Therefore the Montagu Act, being based upon this imperial policy, it is inconceivable that by holding on to this act--by working it--we shall be able to attain what we want, namely, complete National autonomy,

in the struggle between a people and its Government. That is our first declaration. Whatever individual journalists or isolated politicians may say, so far as the united 'voice' of politically-minded Bengal is concerned, so far as that voice is authoritatively expressed by the Bengal Provincial Congress Committee, we say, we have committed ourselves definitely and unequivocally to the principle of Non-Co-operation, in the sense of passive resistance. We have said also that Non-Co-operation in the sense of passive resistance is a perfectly constitutional weapon. We went on in the second resolution, to say, that in view of the indecent haste and the utter disregard of public opinion with which the Rowlatt Act was passed, in view of the administration of the Defence of India Act by which thousands of our youngmen and some old men also were arrested, detained and kept in prison without specification of charges or without trial, considering the way in which Martial law was declared and administered in the Punjab, considering the way in which the Turkish Peace Treaty has been settled by Great Britain and her Allies in absolute disregard of the religious sentiments of the Mahomedan community, and considering the failure of all other methods of political agitation to secure the elementary rights and liberties of the people of India, this Committee is of opinion that Non-Co-operation is the only weapon left to us to achieve our end. These are the main Resolutions that have been adopted by the Bengal Provincial Congress Committee.

CONFUSION OF THINKING

This word Non Co operation, as I said, lends itself to considerable confusion of thinking and we ought to define what we mean by it. In my address in the Indian Association Hall, I used the words 'so far as it may be'. We shall adopt Non Co operation so far as it may be. My old friend of Bow bazar Street (laughter) the 'Bengalee' has seen in it a clever dodge—a clever loop hole by which he thought, I wanted to get out of any inconvenient position in which my acceptance of the principle of Non Co-operation might place me. I am sorry, my friend did not exercise a little, very little imagination. If he had done so he would have seen that we are not such fools as to say that it is possible for any subject population under any Government to even continue to carry on their daily life by absolutely refusing co operation with their Government. We have to buy and sell, and unless we go back to the old days of barter, that is, unless I take my articles to a grocer and tell him—will you give me these things in exchange of my articles? unless I go to the fisher woman and ask her to accept my articles and give me some fish in exchange—and unless I go to the vegetable dealer and ask him to barter his good with mine and so on—how can I live? I have to use money, I have to use silver coins, and the paper money printed on behalf of the Government and by the Government, and in using money—whether paper money or silver money or copper money or nickel money—in using these currencies, we help

to keep up the credit of the Government. If the people refuse to touch paper money, the credit of the Government will be gone. The whole fabric of Government will come down like a house of cards (laughter). But we cannot do it. We are using it. We have to use it. Therefore, absolute Non-Co-operation, to take one instance, is impossible. We have to buy and sell and in buying and selling we have to use the currency of the realm and thereby keep up the credit of the Government. We have to use the railways which are either held by the State or guaranteed by the State. And in going from place to place, importing and exporting merchandises and thus using the railways we are co-operating with the Government. In using the Posts and Telegraphs we are co-operating with the Government. These are some of the elementary things in regard to which Non-Co operation is absolutely impossible. Was I therefore so very wrong to say—was it a clever dodge on my part when I said—I shall adopt Non-Co-operation, so far as it may be. So far as it may be—means, so far as it is possible to adopt Non-Co operation consistently with the demands of my social, my personal and my individual life. That is one thing.

NON-CO-OPERATION.

AS A CONSTITUTIONAL CAMPAIGN.

In the next place, we have discredited the idea of armed revolt, we have repudiated any idea of revolutionary criminalism. Ours is a constitutional move-

and Non-Co-operation as a constitutional movement must work within certain limits. Absolute Non-Co-operation can never be a constitutional movement. Because, Government, bear with me just for a few minutes, while I explain to you the politics of Non-Co-operation—every Government has two classes of functions, one primary and another secondary. The primary function of every State or Government is the preservation of peace and order. When the Government fails to discharge its primary functions, it ceases to be a Government—it no more has the right to govern the people. Therefore, Non-Co-operation cannot be constitutional in regard to the primary functions of Government. It cannot be constitutional in regard to those functions upon which the Government exists as Government—the absence of those functions, the paralysis of the instruments of Government which will lead to the destruction of the Government, and the destruction of Government means anarchy. Government and anarchy are contradictory terms. Where there is Government there cannot be anarchy. Where there is anarchy there can be no Government. If you strike at the primary functions of Government you bring in anarchy and the Government ceases to govern. Therefore, any movement which strikes at the primary functions of the State cannot call itself a constitutional movement. We must clearly understand this. Every Government exists to maintain peace within and to protect the realm against outside invasion and every Government exercises these primary functions through the

police and through the army. These are the two instruments—the police and the army—through which Government exercises its primary functions. If this be so, then Non-Co-operation cannot be applied to these two primary functions of Government. We cannot withdraw our support from the police or from the army. I cannot, 'as a constitutional Non-Co-operator, ask any one to withdraw from the police service or from the army. Then you may say—we are helpless, because it is with the police that the Government terrorises over us, it is with the help of the army that they hold this irresponsible authority over us.'

NON-CO-OPERATION PROPAGANDA AMONG THE POLICE.

But here also there is scope for Non-Co-operation, if you will think it out. I cannot ask my police friend to withdraw from the police service, but I can legitimately ask him not to overstep the legitimate duties of his office in the discharge of his work. I can tell every policeman:—you are here to preserve order and not to terrorise over the people, and if your Police Superintendent, if the Magistrate or if the Commissioner or if any higher authority ask you to do things that are directed towards the terrorisation of the people, stand up in the name of your own conscience, stand up for the integrity of your service, stand up for the preservation of law and order and say it is no part of your duty—we are to preserve order and not to create disorder (hear hear) with a

you will have to administer disciplinary action through your society upon mischievous policemen. You can do it. If a policeman betrays his trust, if a policeman oversteps his legitimate duties, if a policeman cooks cases, if a policeman indulges in crooked practice, and if he is supported in these things either knowingly or without knowledge by his superiors, it will be your duty to take up the social power which is in your hand and punish these policemen. That is the practical way of Non-Co-operation with regard to the police. When you have been able to quicken the conscience of the police and strike, through the disciplinary powers of your society, greater fear in the hearts of the policemen than their official superiors can strike, then, when the time comes and when the policeman is asked to do illegal acts he will say—I will not co-operate, I won't co-operate with you in quelling a riot by force, I will not co-operate with you in dispersing a peaceful crowd by force, I will not co-operate with you in firing upon a mere excited mob, I will not co-operate in outraging the modesty of Indian women (shame, shame), I will not co-operate with you to dishonour those who stand on the same level with my mother and my sister, my wife and my daughter. This is what we have to do. The work is a little more difficult. But freedom is not won by airy—fairy means.

NON-CO-OPERATION IN THE ARMY.

Then with regard to the army. The army represents the instrument of the State for the defence of the

realm against outside invasion That is the legitimate function of the army and I cannot ask the soldier to withdraw co-operation from the Government because that would be striking at the primary function of the State, that would be riding for a revolution, that would be creating conditions which would bring in anarchy We do not want anarchy We want to supplant an autocratic Government by a Government that will be subject to our control and responsible to us Therefore we must lend our support to this primary function of the State viz the defence of the realm against outside invasion Therefore my dear friend though I have accepted the principle of Non Co-operation, I cannot possibly go about among the soldiers and ask them to lay down their arms I cannot do it But here also there is a wide field for me to help our cause How can I do it? The army is for national defence Bear that in mind The Indian army is under no moral or legal obligation to go outside the borders of India to keep in subjection a distant territory conquered by British Imperialism It is no part of the duty of the Indian Army to go to Mesopotamia, it is no part of their duty to go to Abyssinia, it was no part of their duty to go to quell the Boxer Rebellion in China, it was no part of their duty to go and fight Arabi Pasha in Egypt it was no part of their duty to fight the Mahdi in the Soudan These are no parts of the duty of our national army It only exists for the defence of the realm—for the defence of our borders

The national army is necessary for the protection of the territories of the nation from outside invaders. If an invader comes to our borders, every Indian soldier,—and for the matter of that, every Indian who is not a soldier and has never shouldered arms must go and protect his country. But it is no part of his duty—much less a moral obligation—of the Indian Sepoy to go to Mesopotamia and help the subjugation of the newly conquered people by the British; it is no part of the duty of the Indian Sepoy to go to Syria; it is no part of his duty to go to Palestine or Egypt to conquer their territories. It is no part of the duties of my army, that is the national army in India, because this army is our national army though controlled by an alien Government—it is manned by our people. It is a national army and the duty of a national army is to protect the territory of the nation and not to go and appropriate other people's land, not to go and keep a conquered people under subjection. It is no part of the duties of the Indian army to go and help the British Military Capitalist Imperialism to exploit the people, and the natural resources of Mesopotamia or Mosul. Therefore I say that our Non-Co-operation here ought to take this form. We ought to preach courageously, openly and clearly a propaganda of resistance among the Sepoys asking them to perform their legitimate function of the defence of the country and to refuse, in the name of the law and the constitution, of justice and humanity to be used as mercenaries for keeping down

other peoples and other countries under the heel of British Capitalist Imperialism Just now we can preach a crusade against the despatch of Indian Army Divisions to Mesopotamia and Mosul, because Mesopotamia and Mosul have nothing to do with India During the war it might have been justified, because during the war the plea was that the enemy would be coming that way to us Therefore when an invading army is likely to come near you and is coming from a distance, in the interest of the defence of your realm, you can advance a few hundred miles and stop him there (A voice—what was the necessity of sending Indian troops to France?) With regard to France the necessity was this,—we thought that if Germany conquered France and England, she might be able to conquer India That was the plea upon which Indian troops were taken to East Africa But that plea did not hold when Indian troops—before some of you were born—were sent to Abyssinia There was no justification then Therefore I say we can enter a protest and appeal to our soldiers not to allow themselves to be used as an army of occupation in the newly acquired territories in Mesopotamia and Mosul We can do that

NON-PAYMENT OF TAXES

With regard to non payment of taxes, There also we must proceed on absolutely constitutional lines A general declaration of non payment of taxes would be constitutional, because that would strike at

the very root of the Government itself. Hampden did not refuse to pay any and every tax. He refused to pay a particular tax which he considered to be unjust. He refused to pay ship-money America did not refuse to pay any and every tax. She refused to pay tea-cess which it considered unjust. So, you and I cannot declare, make a general declaration, that we shall pay no taxes. We can, as a constitutional movement of Non-Co-operation or passive resistance—we can refuse to pay only a particular tax. In England when the Education Bill was passed and the Non-Conformists rose up in arms against that Act, they refused to pay the education cess. They did not refuse to pay income-tax as that would be an act of rebellion, that would be unconstitutional. But they refused to pay a particular tax. So far as non-payment of taxes is concerned, we ought to consider and take up one or two particular taxes which we consider to be unjust and refuse to pay those taxes. We cannot refuse to pay any and every tax. If you ask me—what tax would you ask us to refuse to pay? Well, so far as the Mesopotamian muddle is concerned, I think it would not be a bad thing—if you can do it—if you do not pay income-tax. You are not—many of you are not—payers of income-tax. But if you can make those who have to pay, refuse to pay it until the Government stops sending Indian Army Divisions and Indian mercenaries to Mesopotamia and Mosul, that would be constitutional. They are within their rights to

say—we will not help you to conquer other people's country with our men, with our money and we refuse to pay income tax with a view to prevent your sending Indian Army Divisions to Mesopotamia and Mosul and conquer these territories. That is a particular instance directed to a particular object and not a general refusal to pay taxes which will lead to the destruction of the Government machinery. You ought to understand that

NON CO OPERATION AND PAYMENT OF RENT

Then again, if you ask me as regards non payment of taxes—well, well, I do not know, how will you take it—but it seems to me that instead of refusing to pay taxes I would ask you to do one thing, which will bring in much greater profit to yourself and to all of us—you can ask the agriculturist not to pay rent. Not non payment of taxes but non payment of rent. What is rent? It is an unjust impost. The land lord receives the rent, on what right?—as the farmer of Government revenue. The Government fixes a certain amount of revenue upon the land and asks my friends—here will you undertake to pay me on a definite date, the revenue and I give you the right to collect it from the tenants—that is the origin of the *Zemindari* system. They are revenue farmers. The revenue was farmed and contracted out to the *Zemindars* by the Government and they are receiving from the tenants what they have no right to receive. It will be a legitimate thing to start a movement, not for the non payment of taxes but

start a movement, as soon as possible, among the raiyats for the non-payment of rent. That would be striking—killing two birds by the same stone (laughter). Because, you must understand it, that this system, the present Bureaucratic system is supported by the Zemindary system (hear, hear) and by getting hold of the Zemindars, by withdrawing your co-operation from them by asking people not to pay rent you can, as I said, kill two birds by the same stone. I am not for non-payment of taxes in a general way. I am for non-payment of a special tax for a special purpose which must be definitely laid down. But I can say that the more effective weapon to bring down the Government upon their knees is to ask the raiyat not to pay rent. If you can organise it, you will be doing much greater good to the cause than by simply talking that we won't pay taxes.

NON-CO-OPERATION IN OFFICIAL EDUCATION.

Then, my dear friends, there remains another thing. You ought to withdraw your co-operation from Government schools and colleges. It is no new cry in Bengal—your College Square is familiar with that old cry. Panthir Math—where the present Metropolitan College Hostel stands—is still resonant with that old cry. Every town in Bengal remembers that old cry. Boycott the University, boycott Government schools and colleges. We tried the experiment. We failed. Why? Because India did not come to our help. We failed, because some of our own leaders could not make the necessary sacrifice that was needed of them (shame,

shame) Do not cry shame Human nature is human nature—what is the good of crying shame Know fact, that is all It failed because proprietors of private colleges who were also political leaders, would not give up their colleges If the proprietors of private schools and colleges in 1906 and 1907 honestly, loyally had thrown themselves into the National Education Movement, I do not know what would have become of the fate of the buildings (The Calcutta University) now But they withheld support More than that, not only they would not give their own colleges but they came to control ours They became members of the National Education Society Perhaps we could not do without them, neither could we do without them (laughter) That was our tragedy The National Education Movement failed in Bengal because India left us alone, because our leaders were not loyal to the call of the country, because our leaders left us and went at the back of the Government of Lord Minto and encouraged it to use the arm of repression to put down our legitimate national movement We failed then owing to these reasons But men rise to higher stages through their failures, and because we failed in 1907, there is no reason to fear that we shall fail also in 1920 The time has come when we must revive, reorganise in the same way, in the same spirit of self-sacrifice, in the same spirit of determination—we must revive our national education movement, because national education must form the foundation of withdrawing co-operation from the Government through

gradually withholding from Government service. The middle classes, the intellectuals of Bengal and elsewhere have no opening or very little opening outside the legal profession or the Government service now, and unless you create openings for them, unless you give the rising generation a different kind of education, different from what they have been receiving—an education that will fit them to earn their livelihood decently, honourably, better than they might be able to earn whether in the so called learned professions or in the service of the Government, you cannot expect them to withdraw from these. National Education will lay the foundation of the movement of Non Co-operation stronger and deeper in the very life of the nation. National Education, therefore, is another positive movement not exactly of Non-Co-operation but as preparatory—specially preparatory—to the movement of Non-Co operation.

NON-CO-OPERATION AND THE LEGAL PROFESSION.

Then as regard to law. As I have said that the police and the army discharge the primary functions of the Government, so do the Courts of Justice. You cannot withdraw your co-operation from these Courts any more than you can do from the police or the army. But here also what you can do, is this. You can carry on a propaganda among the people not to come to these courts unless they are forced by the law of the land to do so. Criminal cases are divided into two classes—cognisable, and

consequence of these things, the lawyers will have to withdraw co-operation from the present Administration.

NON-CO OPERATION AS A CONSCIENCE MOVEMENT.

Then again, with regard to the Khilafat. I have so long considered the question from the political standpoint only. But if a man feels that his conscience demands, his religion demands that he should have nothing to do with the present Bureaucratic Government, in this I have nothing to say to him and it is because he must follow the dictate of his conscience. If my Moslem friends believe that it is against their conscience, it is against their religion to co-operate with a Government that has hurt their religion, the Government which has acted as an enemy towards the Khilafat; if my Moslem friends think that it is their religious duty to refuse co-operation with the Government, then they must do so. There is no consideration here of primary or secondary functions of Government; there is no consideration here of so far and no further (cheers). Because conscience puts no limit to a man's obligations. If my conscience demands that I should jump from here to this Square (College Square), I must do it. I cannot measure the strength of my legs then. Conscience is a tyrant. And so far as my Mahomedan friends are concerned, if they believe that their conscience calls for absolute withdrawal of co-operation from the present Government, because they look upon this Government as the

enemy of the Khilafat, they must do it. If anybody else's conscience demands that because of the Punjab outrages and other things he cannot co-operate in any form, in any matter, or in any degree with the Government, that is a matter which I must leave to every man's honesty—I must leave it to his own conscience. But so far as the political aspect of this question is concerned so far as the constitutional issue involved in this question is concerned so far as national issues are concerned I think we must discriminate, in the way in which I have indicated between the primary and secondary functions of Government and co-operate to the extent that we must do so in regard to the primary functions but refuse to co-operate in regard to the secondary functions.

REAL ENEMIES OF THE KHILAFAT

But with regard even to my Mahomedan friend I have to ask one question here. Who are the enemies of the Khilafat? Lord Chelmsford?—no. His Excellency says, he is not—poor man! he cannot (laughter). Who are the real enemies of the Khilafat then? Not the British Bureaucracy in India. Then who brought about the dismemberment of the Turkish Empire? It is the British plutocrat not the British Bureaucrats in India—it is the British plutocrats who are after the oil fields of Mosul, who are after the rich resources of

Mesopotamia—the men who are after the economic exploitation of the of the Middle East. They are the real enemies of the Khilafat. The Government here is a helpless tool, in the hands of the Anglo-Indian plutocrats. The Government in London also is a tool in the hands of British plutocrats. It is the capitalist who pulls the strings and Lloyd George jumps (hear, hear) ; it is the capitalist who pulls the strings and M. Millerand dances ; it is the capitalist who pulls the strings all the world over for the economic exploitation of weaker peoples and unprotected territories. The Turkish Empire has come to its present miserable condition owing to the greed of the British and French and Italian capitalists. They are the real enemies of the Khilafat,—not Lord Chelmsford—not the British Government in India. My dear Mahomedan friends, this is the truth. The real enemies of your Khilafat are the plutocrats, and why do you like to withdraw co-operation from the poor Bureaucrats leaving the plutocrats in their palaces ? Withdraw your co-operation from every mill that is working here (hear, hear)—those that are worked in this country by foreign capital. Go among the masses and ask them to see that the religion of the Prophet forbids association with the enemies of Islam. In cooking for them, are they not associating with the enemies of Islam ? In blacking their shoes, in driving their coaches, are not they assisting the enemies of Islam ? You would ask the police to

give up their service—you would ask the army to to give up their service, why do you look far, while the weapon, the remedy is near at hand (hear hear)—in the very hollow of your hand? Ask them, if you are honest, if you believe that no faithful Mussalman ought to associate with the enemies of the Khilafat—ask them to do this. The enemies of the Khilafat are the plutocrats, they are those who are exploiting your labour, your materials for their profit in this country, they are those who are making arrangements for exploiting the labour and resources of Mosul and Mesopotamia for their profit, they are the real enemies of Islam—the big British capitalist combines that have egged on the British Cabinet in this matter of peace treaty with Turkey. These plutocrats—British, French and Italian—they are a multitudinous race, they have many forms and many appearances. They are like the octopus and it is they who are the enemies of Islam, it is they who have brought this misery upon Islam, it is they who have arranged for the spoliation of Mesopotamia and Mosul, it is they who are the cause of the deprivation of the liberties of Asia Minor, Syria and Palestine—and you ought to withdraw your co operation from them.

Poor Government—I pity the Government. They have to pay for the sins of many people; poor Lord Chelmsford is paying for the sins of the British.

from the British plutocrats, and if you do this I will join with you (cheers). Because the withdrawal of economic co operation with the exploiters of the natural resources of our country and our cheap labour—is a duty which the love of our country, the love of humanity imposes upon me and you, upon every Indian, irrespective of whether he is a Mahomedan or a Hindu. Therefore, I say, it is not merely a political need—it is more economic than political. And we must strike at the economic exploitation of the country and, in doing so, Swadeshi and Boycott must be our powerful weapon in this campaign of Non-Co-operation. We tried it in Bengal 13 years ago. We failed. But we achieved something also. The new spirit in India, we thank God, is not altogether without indebtedness to the Swadeshi and Boycott Movement in Bengal. Then Bengal stood alone. Now India is at your back. Fear not, because India is at your back. Take up Boycott, take up Swadeshi—boycott in the widest sense of the term, boycott not of goods but of association also—economic association, commercial association and trade association. If we do it, I think we shall be able to win our freedom to which God has called us, much more easily and within much shorter time than you seem to think now. Lord Chelmsford has said—it is the most foolish of all things. Well, well, His Excellency has a right to say anything he pleases. But whether it is the most foolish of all foolish things or the wisest of the most wise things will be seen. And it

will depend, whether it is to be foolish or wise upon your determination upon your spirit of self sacrifice and upon your strength The issue before you is clear Enthusiasm combined with discrimination prudence combined with courage—devotion to duty and to country—if these things come I have no doubt, that what is characterised as the most foolish of all foolish things will turn the wisdom of the wise, by the will of God into folly and consternation

NON-CO-OPERATION AND THE KHILAFAT.

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I have been speaking for the last three or four days on Non-Co-operation and although I thought that what I told you on the last occasion was all that had to be said, it seemed to me, on second thought, that we might profitably consider in a special lecture the question of the Khilafat in regard to Non-Co-operation.

EGYPTIAN INDEPENDENCE.

Since then, however, an important news has come to this country which may not be without its reference to the question that we are considering, viz. the Khilafat and Non-Co operation and also to the ideal and the objective that we have in view. That news is the proposal to form a Treaty of Alliance between Great Britain and Egypt—a treaty by which Great Britain agrees to recognise Egyptian independence (loud and continued cheers). Now, gentlemen, the question that you and I have to consider is this. Has this new development in British Imperialist policy any reference to our own struggle for national emancipation? That is a very natural question that arises in our mind when we read the news that Lord Milner and the Egyptian Mission headed by Zaghlul Pasha have agreed to a certain understanding for the settlement of the Egyptian question.

Hitherto we have been used to link Egypt and India together in our struggle for political emancipation in the British Empire Years ago, 12 years ago 11 years ago strictly speaking a very important article appeared in the Times newspaper, on the 24th of May 1909 in its Empire Day Supplement In that article it indicated a certain line of policy of British Imperialism Those who read between the lines could at once see the inspiration of Lord Milner behind that important article In that article the Times said that the British Empire was not one but really two, combined into one One was the self governing Empire including Great Britain and the Dominions the other was the depending or dependent Empire including the Crown Colonies, the Protectorates and India Egypt and India and the Crown Colonies went together to constitute the dependent Empire, while Great Britain, Canada, Australia South Africa and New Zealand—all these White Dominions of the Empire constituted the self governing Empire, and the self governing Empire was also the governing Empire either at present or was meant to be in future in regard to the dependent Empire That was the 'Times policy The 'Times said that these the depending Empire and the self governing Empire are essential each to the other and the depending Empire wants the self-governing Empire to guide it, to educate it, to train it, to protect it, to develop its resources and thereby lead it to a higher state of

civilisation. That was the place of the depending Empire. The depending Empire meant Egypt and India, and Egypt and India offered a ground for the cultivation of the altruistic sentiment of British Imperialism for the uplift of men. And as regards the self-governing Empire, they are bound together by ties of common language, they are bound together by common civilisation, they are bound together by common inspiration to work together for the up-lift and regeneration of the depending Empire. That was in 1909. This idea of dual Empire runs through everything that has been done during the last ten years in India including the Montagu-Chelmsford Reforms in regard to India. This idea runs through it, namely, that they are to uplift us, they are to guide us, they are to train us, they are to protect us, they are to develop us, they are to civilise us and gradually they are to help us to a high state even of political existence. This idea runs through the whole policy of Egypt and India. Now, suddenly we find that the British have recognised or are prepared to recognise, the independence of the Egyptians. Now this is 1920. In 1916, in the summer of that year, just a little more or less than four years ago, Lord Milner himself in his address to the representatives of the Dominions Parliaments, representatives of Canada, Australia and South Africa who had come to England in the summer of that year,—Lord Milner addressing these Dominions representatives then on a visit to England, said, when he was discussing the problem of Imperial reconstruction and reconstitution

of the Empire that it would needlessly complicate the task immediately before them' mark every word—'it would needlessly complicate the task before them. What is the task? The task is 'that of devising a means by which the Dominions can share with the United Kingdom in the supreme control of the Empire.' Now that was the policy of British Imperialism in 1916. At present Great Britain controls the policy of the Empire—it is the British Cabinet and the British Parliament which practically direct the policy of the Empire with regard to the Dependencies, the Protectorates and the Crown Colonies and Lord Milner said that the task before them is of devising means by which the Dominions could share with the United Kingdom in the supreme control of the Empire. It would needlessly complicate their task if they were to try and deal at the same time with the future of India where self government is in its infancy or with those of the Dependencies in which it exists in various degrees or does not exist at all. In 1916 Lord Milner said that he cannot discuss this question of the future of India or of the other Dependencies—evidently including Egypt also. To say that 'is not to deny, however that a day may come when having proved themselves capable of local autonomy some or all of them will be entitled to representation in the Imperial Parliament. But the time at which and the extent to which such representation should be accorded to them are quite unforeseeable at present and to give it to them, while local self government is still in its rudimentary stage would be putting the

cart before the horse." Now, you see clearly—in 1916 his lordship, Lord Milner was not prepared to pay any thought to the problem of the political future, inside the British Empire, either of India or of the other Dependencies including Egypt. During the war and even before the war we had been told repeatedly that Egypt was not fit to govern herself. In 1910-11 when I was in England, I met Egyptian Nationalists—leaders of the Egyptian National Movement and they were then more or less exiles from their own homes, because of the repressive measures of Lord Cromer and the Government there. During the war we knew, though we heard very little of the internal condition of Egypt,—but it is generally known that during the war Egypt was practically converted into a military garrison. Last year, this time when I was going to England, I tried to land in Egypt, but I could not land even in Suez because it was under military law and a permit from the Officer Commanding had to be got, before any foreigner, whether Indian or anybody else were allowed to land in Suez or any other part of the Egyptian territory. That was last year. What has happened since then? Have the Egyptians developed over-night, by some magical influence (laughter) the powers of self-government? How have they worked this miracle in the course of a few weeks? Because it was fairly well known even when this Milner Mission went to Egypt that they were not there with a view to grant or recognise Egyptian independence, but to do something

movement in India may lend strength to that unrest in Egypt and the Egyptian unrest may lend strength to the Khilafat movement and the Moslem sentiment in India for freedom and autonomy. (cheers). Now it is politic, it is wise always to take care of your rear-guard, to protect your back when you are fighting your enemies. Secondly, it is of the utmost importance and it is the height of wisdom when you are fighting a number of enemies, to draw one or two away from the enemies camp on to your side, so that by drawing him away you may be able at once to weaken your opponents and strengthen yourself. That seems to me—I am rather an evil-minded person—clearly to be the policy that has prompted this measure of generous wisdom of British statemanship.

INDIA AND EGYPTIAN INDEPENDENCE

But how does it affect us? That it is likely—they think not we—to weaken not only our Khilafat movement itself, but by withdrawing the sympathy and support of the Egyptian Mahomedans from what was hitherto our common cause, it may weaken the struggle for India's freedom. It may—I do not say it will, because God confounds always the wisest among men even in their very wisdom. So I do not say it will, but it may. But there is another consideration with regard to this. You and I have been thinking for many years past of working out our freedom inside the federation . . .

British Empire Imperial Federation has been for the last 10 or 12 years the sheet anchor of our hope for national freedom. We thought that the day was coming when Great Britain would have to reconstitute her Empire upon a federal basis and when she started this work of Imperial reconstruction or reconstitution, upon a federal basis, she would be forced to admit India and Egypt and other Dependencies to an equal place with the White Dominions and the United Kingdom, in this Imperial Federation. We were all looking forward to it and because we were dreaming of this Imperial Federation we gave up the very thought of sovereign, isolated independence for India. I myself had been seeing the vision of an Imperial Federation which would mediate between nationalism and universal humanity in the course of modern historic evolution. I was looking forward to such a development of the Imperial policy which would convert the present British Empire into something like the United States of every nationality, of every principality, of every country inside the British Empire—absolutely free in regard to their own affairs but combined with the representatives of the other members of the Empire for the common governance of the Empire—for the regulation of the common policy of the Empire. That was the ideal which was leading us on and that ideal led us to give up our demand for sovereign national independence and prefer the somewhat limited freedom of a federal union. But if Egypt has got her

independence—if Great Britain has been forced to to recognise the independence of Egypt, the question before you and me to-day is: is not our vision of an Imperial federation a dream, a delusion and a snare? (cheers). That is the first question that arises in our mind. Because, if British Imperialism had any serious idea of working out a federal constitution in the Empire, it would not have rushed with almost indecent haste to grant sovereign independence to Egypt.

RE-CONSIDERATION OF OUR IDEAL AND OBJECTIVE.

Therefore it seems, my dear friends, that the time has come when we must reconsider our own position, reconsider the Congress creed itself reconsider whether we shall not put forward the same thing on behalf of India which British statemanship has offered to Egypt (hear hear). And I say it for this reason. As I have repeatedly said, I would prefer a Federal Union with the other members of the present British Empire, to Sovereign Independence. But this new Egyptian policy indicates that there is little hope of the present day British Imperialists working out this Federation in time to enable us to win our freedom before we die as a race. Therefore I say every Congressman and every politically minded Indian—be he a Hindu or a Mahomedan—will have to seriously reconsider now whether it is not necessary, in view of the latest developement in Imperial policy indicated by the results

of the conference between the Milner Mission and the Egyptian Mission headed by Zaghal Pasha—whether in view of this development—it is not our duty as much to ourselves as to the Empire and to the whole of humanity to restate our ideal and objective, whether we shall not put forth the same demand for independence which has been recognised by British statesmanship in the case of Egypt. (hear hear)

NON CO OPERATION AND THE NEW IDEAL

Now, gentlemen, in putting forth this demand—in fighting for our freedom, we shall have to adopt practically the same measures which we have been discussing during the last 4 or 5 days, viz. Non-Co operation. I do not know what effect this Egyptian settlement will have upon the Khilafat movement in India, upon the Khilafat sentiment in India,—but it seems to me that we cannot allow this diplomatic move on the part of British statesmanship to any way weaken or demoralise the Khilafat movement in India. As regards the Khilafat movement we must understand one thing. We, who are non Mahomedans must understand one thing, viz that though the Khilafat question is a religious question with our Mahomedan friends, it is no less a vital political question with us. I support the Khilafat movement (hear, hear) though not on sentimental grounds. I honour sentiment—I sympathise with my Mahomedan friends in the hour of their trouble—I fully sympathise with them in their endeavour to secure and maintain the integrity of their

religion which is bound up organically with integrity of the Khilafat (hear, hear). As the Roman Catholic religion is bound up organically with the Catholic Church, so Islami is with the Khilafat. As Bhudhistic piety is bound up with the Sangha, so is Islam with the Islamic Brotherhood. There is no Islam apart from the Islamic brotherhood or fraternity and they are organically bound up together like thought and its expression,—like the soul and the body. Islam is the soul and Islamic fraternity is the body of that soul and the Islamic Fraternity is symbolised in the institution of the Khilafat. If the Khilafat goes the symbol or the instrument of the common life of Islam goes, and if the symbol or the instrument of the common life of Islam goes, Islam cannot live long. That is the view that I take of the Khilafat movement and I sympathise fully with the struggle of my Mahomedan brethren for the maintenance of the purity, as they understand it, the integrity as they believe it, of their own religion. I sympathised with the struggle of the Huguenots—we sympathised with the struggle of the French Huguenots. When we read of the story of the fight for religious freedom, when we read of the story of the fight for the conscience of the French Huguenots, we are thrilled with a sympathy for them. Are not we? When we read the story of the struggle for the religious freedom of the British Puritans, do we not feel a thrill in our own hearts, at the bravery, at the devotion to truth, at the loyalty to conscience and the courage and sacrifice of the Puritan Christians. Yet

I am not a Hugenot,—I am not a Christian—simply an ordinary man, a sensitive human being, one who holds every religion in reverence, who believes that every religion is a revelation of God in its own place and in its own time to those who follow it.

PARTIES OF THE KHILAFAT MOVEMENT.

We, who believe like this, cannot be indifferent to the woes of our Mahomedan friends when they see and believe that their religion is being hurt by British Imperialism and European Imperialism. I sympathise with them not on sentimental grounds—that is a high ground. Mere sympathy would not lead me to identify myself with the Khilafat movement. It would be necessary to have something else; and I identify myself with this movement not on sentimental grounds but for high political reasons. I recognise and I want every Hindu to recognise this that the future of India not of the Mahomedans only but of the Hindus as well, the future and freedom of the Indian nation, depend almost entirely upon the preservation of the integrity and the independence of the Turkish Empire (hear, hear). Because if Turkey goes—it is practically gone, for the time being, I hope Persia will go. Persia is going. If Persia goes, Afghanisthan will not be able to long retain its independent position. And if Turkey goes, Persia goes, Afghanisthan goes, then what happens? From San Francisco to the borders of China, 'as I said on another occasion, the whole of the extensive

region, one-third—more than one-third, of Asia along with Africa, come under direct Christian influence. That is a danger to Asia—that is a danger to the Asiatic culture as much as it is to Islam—that is a danger to India. These Mahomedan States have been a bulwark of Indian freedom. Every Independent State in the neighbourhood of a despotic government works for the weakening of that despotism, because a despot always stands in fear of his rival. But if all these independent States are wiped off from the face of the Asiatic map the result will be an increase in the despotism—in the greed of capitalist Military Imperialism of Europe. Therefore I want the Khilafat to remain—I want Persia and Afghanistan to remain. And on these political grounds I not only sympathise with the Khilafat movement, I identify myself as an Indian nationalist wholeheartedly with it. With me the Khilafat is a political question—it is not a question of conscience. With my Mahomedan friends it is a question of conscience added to a political question. The Mahomedans also, now at any rate, have recognised their place in the scheme of Indian Nationalism. Mahomedans, also, are recognised as Nationalists. And as Nationalists they have a political interest in the preservation of the integrity and independence of the Khilafat. As Mahomedans they have a religious interest in the preservation of the independence and integrity of the Khilafat. And we who are non-Mahomedans identify ourselves with this Mahomedan movement

from clearly, distinctly political reasons. Let there be no mistake about it. We support the Khilafat on political grounds and I have explained those grounds to you.

Now the question comes—the Khilafat movement with regard to Non-Co operation. How far can we go with the Khilafat in this matter. I have already indicated to you that the Central Khilafat Committee have practically declared though, more or less progressively, for absolute Non-Co operation. The Central Khilafat Committee have declared, for instance, for the withdrawal of candidature from the new councils. Here I cannot follow them. They have also called for other steps of Non Co operation. As I told you the other day our Non-Co operation as a constitutional movement must be confined within Constitutional limits. Non Co operation must not strike at those functions of the State which are primary functions. Non Co operation must help the preservation of the State and at the same time fight the autocracy of the Government. That is our policy. But with regard to the Khilafat, as I told you the other day, when it is a question of conscience, constitutional considerations cannot enter into it. If my conscience demands to do anything—if my conscience demands a thing which is against the constitution of the Government, my conscience must be obeyed though Governments may fall (hear, hear) "Fiat Justitia ruet cœlum" let justice reign though heavens should fall—let conscience

reign though Governments fall (hear, hear). Therefore so far as it is a question of conscience we must accept what the conscience of the Mahomedans demands and must lend our moral support to that movement of conscientious Non-Co-operation even if it oversteps the limits of constitutional agitation, without informing the rights and libertees of other people, though we may not ourselves practically follow or join it. That is our position in regard to the Khilafat Non-Co-operation

With regard to the boycotting of the new councils the question with the Khilafat Committee is a question of conscience. They say that they cannot co-operate in any shape or form with a Government which has acted in the way that this Government has done in regard to the Khilafat. That is their position. And I repeat once more, that position being based on conscience I have nothing to say about it. But with me, Non-Co-operation is not a question of conscience—it is with me, as a Non-Mahomedan, a question of policy. It is a means to an end and with me the question is what is the end.

OBJECTIVE OF NON-CO OPERATION.

What is the objective of our Non-Co operation movement. So far as the conscientious non-co-operator is concerned Non-Co-operation itself is an end. He has not to consider results, because his conscience demands that he should withdraw co-

operation from the Government and he must obey his conscience whatever may be the consequences either to himself or to others. So far as Mahomedans are concerned, there is no question of the object—there is no question of the end—the end is the obedience to one's conscience. But with us—who are non Mahomedans who are Non Co operators not on conscientious grounds but on political grounds—with us the question is *what is the object of Non Co operation?* Why do we start this campaign of Non Co operation? Our object is to weaken—to paralyse more or less, the administration. That is the object of all passive resistance. To bring such irresistible pressure upon the administrative machinery that it will either have to stop working or surrender itself to the will of the people (hear hear). That is the object of Non Co operation, either to stop the working of the administrative machinery or to force those who control the machinery to surrender themselves to the will of the people. And every means, every proposal in regard to Non Co operation we must judge by its end. We are asked to give up honorary titles and offices and we judge of it by this means—will it weaken the Administration? I say, yes, not materially but morally and that is far more important than materially weakening the Government. The Government rules in the way that it rules us as now, because of our slavish mentality. We are a race of slaves. The best among us are slaves in their minds.

(shame, shame). There is no shame, my friends, because water never rises above its level, and when you have been a nation of slaves for so many hundreds of years the national mind cannot easily, simply by a few words from an orator, cure itself of its inherent slave nature. The slave mentality is there. You see it every day in your newspapers. Your thought-leaders do not think courageously. Your politicians dare not handle public questions with courage. Your statesmen, if there be any, are statesmen only in compromising (laughter). That is the quality of your statesmanship—timid and cowardly. That is the character of the whole nation and this slave mentality is the real root of our present servitude. And by declaring withdrawal of co-operation from the Government, by giving up all honorary titles, decorations and honorary offices, we remove the slave mentality of the people, we free the mind of the people. Therefore, it is part of the scheme of Non-Cooperation. By asking the police not to go beyond their legitimate duties but to refuse to obey their superior officers when they order them, not to preserve peace but to disturb peace, when they order them to act as provocative agents, when they order them directly or indirectly to cook conspiracies, when they order them to spy on honest citizens, when they order them to break peaceful processions and gatherings—by asking them to refuse to obey these, we create a moral force in the community. The policemen ought to be trained—ought to be asked, and if they do

obey your commands you ought to organise social disciplinary measures so that the policeman who outrages your liberties the policeman who goes beyond his legitimate functions—that policeman may find his reward in Government pay and pension for himself and his people but he shall find no help no co operation in his buying and selling not in marrying and giving in marriage, from the members of his society That is Non Co operation with regard to the police And the same thing might be done with regard to others also With regard to all these we reach our objective by weakening the administration In regard to the withdrawal of co operation from the capitalist exploiters of our economic resources and our cheap labour we strike at the root of our servitude because the Government of India is not merely an administration—administration and exploitation, as Lord Curzon reminded us many years ago are parts of the same duty in the Government of India They are joined together like the Siamese twins—the exploiter and the administrator So if you hurt the exploiter you weaken the administration, because the administration is for exploitation and exploitation helps the administration Here also in withdrawing co operation from the exploitation of our raw materials our natural resources and our labour by foreign capitalists, you weaken the Government You paralyse to a certain extent the instruments of the present autocratic and irresponsible administration in the

COUNCIL ELECTIONS.

With regard to the Councils, the question is—by keeping yourself outside the Councils, by refusing to allow yourself to be elected to the Councils, will help to weaken the administration? I have told you in the course of these Lectures that the Montagu Reform Act, will not secure your freedom and the sooner that Act is amended the better it is for you and me. But will you be able to compel the amendment of this Act along your own lines by withdrawing yourselves from the Councils? You keep yourselves out from the Councils and accommodating politicians will have an easy walk over to the seats in the Councils (laughter) and being there in the Councils they will support the Ministers and the Ministers will support them, and they will be all a friendly family circle (laughter). The whole machinery will go on as smoothly as the heart of Mr. Montagu might desire. Lord Chelmsford has been pleased to appeal for co-operation. ‘You have got here a wonderful machinery for working out your salvation. Come, put your shoulders to the wheel of this machinery and work it and your freedom will be yours’. That is Lord Chelmsford’s appeal. We know that this Act will not give us our freedom—not even by an inch or a jot or tittle. We know that if we are to get freedom, if we are to get National Independence if we are to have our independence recognised by Great

are in the council, and we offer opposition to the executive Government we have no chance of replacing them ourselves. We shall be offering opposition continuously, permanently, perpetually until that Government falls to pieces—until the whole system is broken up and is replaced by a more democratic—by a truly honest parliamentary system. That is it. Therefore opposition will destroy the present camouflage and the present semblance, the present deceitful appearance of parliamentary Government in India. And by breaking it down we shall make room for building up a truly honest and democratic system of Government in our country (hear. hear). Therefore, I say the dictum that parliamentary Government thrives on opposition is inapplicable to India because ours is not a parliamentary Government. Therefore our policy in regard to the council must be this. As Non-Co-operators we shall go to the council and there refuse to Co-operate with the executive Government. We shall refuse to help them. Under the new law, the budget will have to be passed by the provincial legislative council. If we have a majority in the council we shall refuse to pass the budget. Under the present provincial constitution every legislation must be passed by the council. If we have a majority in the council we shall refuse to pass official legislation and by refusing to pass the legislation—by refusing to pass the budget we shall force the Governor to have recourse to

Britain as an ally of the British Empire like Egypt we shall have to kill this Act—we shall have to create deadlocks in the operation of this Act, so that the Government will be compelled to amend it before the ten year period is over. That is our policy, or that ought to be our policy. Therefore, we cannot boycott these new Councils as a part of our campaign of Non Co operation. It has been said that Parliamentary Government thrives on opposition. Yes, but your Government is not a Parliamentary Government, it is the shadow of Parliamentary Government, it is camouflage of Parliamentary Government. A merely legislative council does not constitute parliamentary Government. The soul of Parliamentary Government is the Cabinet system. Do you understand what the Cabinet system is? That is the Executive is formed by the party which is in the majority in the legislature and this party which is in the majority supplies the executive Government to-day while those who are in the Opposition try to fight this party and try to get their place to-morrow. Those who are in the Opposition to-day go to the office to-morrow and therefore opposition in the parliamentary system is like the healthy criticism in your schools and colleges. Healthy criticism strengthens the roots of your knowledge, so parliamentary opposition strengthens the roots of the system of parliamentary administration. It is only in this sense that parliamentary Government thrives on opposition, is true. But when we

are in the council, and we offer opposition to the executive Government we have no chance of replacing them ourselves. We shall be offering opposition continuously, permanently, perpetually until that Government falls to pieces—until the whole system is broken up and is replaced by a more democratic—by a truly honest parliamentary system. That is it. Therefore opposition will destroy the present camouflage and the present semblance, the present deceitful appearance of parliamentary Government in India. And by breaking it down we shall make room for building up a truly honest and democratic system of Government in our country (hear, hear). Therefore, I say the dictum that parliamentary Government thrives on opposition is inapplicable to India because ours is not a parliamentary Government. Therefore our policy in regard to the council must be this. As Non-Co-operators we shall go to the council and there refuse to Co-operate with the executive Government. We shall refuse to help them. Under the new law, the budget will have to be passed by the provincial legislative council. If we have a majority in the council we shall refuse to pass the budget. Under the present provincial constitution every legislation must be passed by the council. If we have a majority in the council we shall refuse to pass official legislation and by refusing to pass the legislation—by refusing to pass the budget we shall force the Governor to have recourse to

his extraordinary power under the new Act by which he is authorised to reinstate the budget even if it be thrown away by the legislature. That is we shall bring out the autocracy which lies hidden under the present system, and if in two successive sessions we can force the Governor to reinstate the budget against the decision of the legislature—if we force the provincial Governor to pass any law that he wants against the wishes of the legislature—we will create such a wild hue and cry in the country—such a wide wave against this autocracy that England will be forced to amend this Act. And if it does not, there will be a deadlock in the administration. Therefore I say our campaign of Non Co operation, not being based upon conscience, but being based upon policy, our Non Co operation having for its object the weakening of the administration, the paralysis of certain departments of the Government, with a view to force it to surrender itself to the popular will, we cannot boycott these councils. But on the contrary, we ought to send only such men to the council who will go there to organise a powerful opposition there and refuse to Co operate with the ministers or with the executive Government or any body else (hear, hear). Non co operation in regard to the councils must be that

LAST APPEAL.

Now, my friends, I must close and before I
I want to make a last appeal—one to the

Government, and one to you. To the Government my appeal is—we have been repeatedly told that this Non-co-operation movement conceals a great danger to the peace and order in the country. I do not believe that there is any danger of the disturbance of peace in this Non-Co-operation movement. There is no danger to it in any case as long as Mahatma Gandhi (loud cheers) is at the helm of it. He is for Non-violence and so far, he has restrained the otherwise irritable and inflammable materials inside the Khilafat movement. The presence of the Hindus and their association with it, are a guarantee for the preservation of peace and order in that movement. If we had not joined the movement it would have gone on its own way and we fear—we tremble to think, how it would have gone on. It is the restraining influence of Mahatma Gandhi—it is the restraining influence of Indian Nationalists who are moved by political foresight and statesmanly motive in throwing themselves into this movement—that has restrained this movement within constitutional limits up till now. We want to keep it so and we shall keep it so. The danger is in those provocative actions and agencies of the Government which may at any time throw a lighted match into this powder magazine. It is a powder magazine—but as long as we have got the key to this magazine and you do not come to interfere with this magazine—as long as you do not create friction at the door of it—as long as you do

not employ police informers and approvers and agents to create disturbance in it, this Khilafat movement, so long, God willing, will remain peaceful (cheers) Therefore my appeal to the Government is to stay their hand Mr Montagu has raised his stick (laugh) It does not hurt any body We also know how to raise our stick (laughter) He has raised his stick in parliament The Khilafat and the whole of Nationalist India have raised their stick in this Non Co operation So I donot mind his raising the big stick I have noticed the threat in Lord Chelmsford's last opening speech before the council session in Simla But I would ask his Excellency to seriously consider what the effect of any repressive measure will be not upon the Khilafat itself but upon the whole country We are pledged—every one of us who has any influence over this movement and is religiously pledged—Mahatma Gandhi is pledged—Mr Shaikat Ali (cheers) is pledged and all the leaders of the Khilafat committee—every one is pledged—to keep this movement strictly within constitutional, lawful and peaceful limits And as long as they keep themselves within these limits they ought to have the fullest freedom of thought of speech, of association of movement—of organising themselves for a constitutional fight Their conscience must be respected and anything that their conscience demands ought not to be interefered with We shall try, we who are not
 1 Jans but who have more or less thrown

ourselves into the Khilafat agitation directly or indirectly—we shall try, God willing, our level best to restrain the movement within lawful, peaceful limits and even within constitutional limits, so far as their conscience will allow. But their conscience does not demand violence, therefore we are perfectly sure if Government will restrain itself, if the Government will restrain the enthusiasm of our C. I. D.—if the Government will restrain its hands, then we are confident that this movement will be kept within absolutely peaceful limits. But although speaking for myself and for those who have approached the question from the political point of view, although we may not accept the whole programme of Mahatma Gandhi and the Khilafat Committee on Non-Co-operation—although we may differ from them now in regard to the actual carrying out of the whole programme, let the Government know this, that we shall try so far as it lies in our power to lend moral support to this movement of conscience of the Mahomedan members of our community, and let the Government know this also that so far as it lies in our power, although we do not accept Mahatma Gandhi's full programme to-day on reasonable and political and constitutional grounds, if repression should come upon Mahatma Gandhi—if the hand of repression should be laid upon the Khilafat movement it will be our duty as men—as citizen—as Indian nationalists it will be our duty

to accept the whole programme of the Khilafat movement. And I, for one, should very much like the Special Congress whatever other decision it may come to in regard to the details of this Non-Co-operation programme, whether it accepts Mahatma Gandhi's programme or not, one thing ought to be made clear, viz. that if repression comes upon those who are trying to follow this programme at the dictate of their conscience, the united opinion of India, the united heart of India—the united manhood of India—the united head and the united arm of India (cheers) will be placed at the service of the Khilafat Committee. We will share their sufferings (hear, hear)—we will share their endeavours—we will take part in their fight and we will take the consequences upon ourselves (hear, hear). We will not allow the Government again to divide our house as they divided during the Swadeshi agitation days in Bengal. We will not allow the Government to pat us on the back and say 'O', you are good boys, you are constitutional, they are bad boys we shall punish them, No my master my paternal Government (laughter.) If you punish my brother, I will put my back between his back and your lash (hear, hear) That ought to be the determination of every Indian at this moment. This is a momentous decision which the Congress ought to take up in the Special Session (hear, hear.) There should be left no doubt in the minds of Government, viz that Congress will support

the programme of the Khilafat Committee and throw itself bodily and accept the whole programme of Mahatma Gandhi and will call upon the country to accept and carry it out, should the Government try its hand of repression upon him and upon the Khilafat (hear, hear). I hope, my dear friends, those of you who are delegates, who are members of the Congress, will kindly consider these my submissions, and I hope when the day comes you will commit yourself and compel the Congress to commit itself to this policy, viz. that if repression comes we shall accept and call upon the country to accept the whole of the programme of Mr. Gandhi and the Khilafat Committee. Do help us God. (Loud and prolonged cheers,)

Swarajya Series—No. 1.

NON-CO-OPERATION
AND
STUDENTS

MAHATMA GANDHI, C. R. DAS & OTHERS

SARASWATY LIBRARY
9, RAMANATH MAZUMDAR STREET,
CALCUTTA.

Price 4 annas only

NON-CO-OPERATION

AND

STUDENTS

The strength of the Government lies in the people's ignorance and the Government knows this. And it is most undesirable to let the Government while it is spreading darkness pretend to be busy with the enlightenment of the people. It is doing this now by means of the pseudo educational establishments which it controls: schools, high schools, universities and academies etc.

—Tolstoy

What will you offer? they asked. Offer! I offer, you hardship, hunger, rags, thirst, sleepless nights, foot sores in the long marches, privations innumerable and victory in a Noble cause.

—Garribaldi

Second Edition

MANORANJAN GUPTA B.A.
SARASWATY LIBRARY
9 RAMANATH MAZUMDER STREET
CALCUTTA

Price 4 Annas

FIRST EDITION

January, 1921

SECOND EDITION

February 1921

.

MESSAGE OF MAHATMA GANDHI. TO YOUNG BENGAL.

Dear Young Friends, I have just read an account of your response to the Nation's call. It does credit to you and Bengal. I had expected no less—I certainly expect still more. Bengal has great intelligence, a greater heart, more than its share of the spiritual heritage, imagination, faith and emotion. There is no reason therefore, why Bengal should not lead. Now, that you have taken the step, you will not recede. You had ample time to think,—you have paused and considered. You hold the Congress that first delivered to the Nation the message of Non-co-operation. The Nagpur Congress ratified, clarified and amplified this declaration. The message was delivered in strife, doubt and disunion, but, at Nagpur it was re-delivered amidst joy, acclamation and practically perfect unanimity. It was open to you to refuse or hesitate.

But you have chosen the better, though from worldly standpoint, less cautious way. You dare not go back without hurting yourselves and the cause. We cannot get Swaraj if not one class in the country is prepared to work and sacrifice for it. Government will yield not to logic of words. It knows no logic save that of brave true deeds.

Suspend studies for one year and study the methods of bringing Swaraj, quietly even within one year. I

present you with this 'spinning-wheel, which, is the secret of Swaraj, since on it depends India's economic salvation. I call upon the entire Indian student world to suspend normal studies; since these are abnormal times and the nation is engaged in spiritual war. Just as during the late war every factory was turned into an arsenal for turning out lead bullets, so during this war every national school and college should be turned into a factory for preparing tons of yarns with which to liberate the nation:

do In other words, the opponents do not sufficiently realise the significance of the Punjab and the Khilafat wrongs. They do not feel as the others do that these wrongs show conclusively that the sum total of the activity of the present Government is injurious to national growth. I know that this is a serious statement to make. It is unthinkable that Malaviya and Shastriar cannot feel the wrongs even as I do. And yet that is precisely my meaning. I am positive that they will not put their children in a school where there was any likelihood of their becoming degraded instead of being elevated. I am equally positive that they would not send their children to a school managed controlled or even influenced by a robber who had robbed them of their possessions. I feel that the nation's children suffer degradation in the Government schools. I feel that these schools and colleges are under the influence of a Government that has deliberately robbed the nation of its honour, and therefore the nation must withdraw its children from such schools. It may be that some learning even in such schools may be able to resist the progress of degradation. But it cannot be right to countenance national humiliation going on in the schools because some have risen above their environment. In my opinion it is self-evident that the honoured leaders of the nation to-day do not realise that the Government-controlled schools are tainted in the manner described by me.

It may be urged that the schools are no worse to-day than they were before the Punjab wrong or the Khilafat breach, and that we tolerated them before the events. I admit that the schools are not much

Is not the nation able to take charge of its own education without any Government intervention, protection, advice of grant ? Abandonment of the present schools means consciousness of our ability to educate ourselves in spite of Himalayan difficulties

MAHATMA GANDHI.

STUDENTS ARE THE ARCHITECTS OF A NATION'S FREEDOM.

Friends It is your *karma* to live at a great hour in India's destiny. For let us confess it, this Movement of Non-Co-operation is revolutionary in its character. It is pledged to a creed of non-violence : but it does mean to revolutionise the minds and hearts of the people. It is your *karma* to live at the birth-hour of such a movement. That *karma* may be your *privilege* if you resolve to help the Nation at this hour. And the thought I would have you take with you to-night is that you, students and youngmen, can do much. I know the teaching given you in the Government controlled institutions is not responsive to the National Ideal. Your schools and colleges, as they are to-day, are

PRISON-HOUSES.

when they should be *open windows* letting in the light of the great Life of the Nation. Your education is not related to the *life of India*. Do your College text-books tell you of Tagore in literature, of Shah Latif in lyric poetry, of Sir J. C. Bose in science, of Hindu-darshanas

in philosophy, of Tilak or Gandhi in politics? Surveying the Indian situation several years ago. Lok. Tilak said:—"The remedy is not petition but boycott." Of boycott, as a political method you read little in your text-books which tell either of 'constitutional' agitation or violence. Again Mahatma Gandhi's *satyagraha* is a method not known to your text-books in political science. They tell you that the basis of society is *force*, the great Indian leader tells you that society lives by *satya*, the *power of the soul*, the

WILL-TO-SUFFER.

For that to me is the essential meaning and message of *satyagraha* and non-co-operation. Europe's 'nationalisms', its very internationals, are expressions of Europe's will-to-power. Europe's League of Nations is really a League of Imperialisms, and can not give the world that peace which the Nations will not find until they become Servants of Humanity. Of these and other things congenial to the Indian mind little is told you in your text-books. Therefore I said your schools are prison-houses, they shut you out of the thought and life of India: In American institutions they teach sciences, humanities and Americanism, in India they teach you several subjects but not the one subject needful—India:

Yet I would not have you take with you any depressing thought, I wish you to have the inspiring thought that you can do much for the Nation. The motive of my talk with you is to awaken, in you, if I can, 'faith' in yourselves and your powers to make a

mighty Nation History shows how much young men and

STUDENT MOVEMENTS

have done for the Nations Think of Athens * Socrates was not alone a thinker he was a Patriot, and he wished to help the life of Greece by inspiring young men with the ideals of truth and Beauty and Justice A corrupter of youth they called this Teacher of ancient Greece, he did not mind what his enemies said or did to discredit him he went about doing good One of his pupils was Plato and Aristotle was Platos pupil and in the hearts of these two young men—as readers of the 'Republic' and the 'Politics' know—in the hearts of these two Greeks who owed much to the inspiration of the Socratic Teaching—in their hearts was the vision of a strong moral State which Greece could only partially assimilate Think of Italy There was a time as some of you may know when Italy was under the heels of Austria

MAZZINI

arose with a dream of Italian emancipation in his heart and Mazzini spread his message through students and young men he formed, you know, the 'Order of Young Italy' Think of the Germany of pre-War days In the days of Metternich Germany was in a sorry state But it was the German students who dreamt the dream of a great fatherland Some of them grew to be the great proclaimers of Liberty in Germany One of them was Marx the Father of the

Modern Revolution against capitalism. Other students who dreamt of liberty and who, in the days of their manhood, served Germany in several fields were Engel, Heine, and Lassale. Think of Egypt.

NATIONAL UNIVERSITY

of Elzeher is, I believe, one of the greatest of the world's universities; over ten thousand students reside there, every year, and are trained for nation-service; how much they have helped Egypt by organising meetings and processions, and spreading the message of Freedom in villages is known to every student of Egyptian nationalism. Japan owes much to her students; one of them,

Togo,

longed to do great things for her; he went to Europe to study. Western science: he returned to Japan to serve her and make her great among the nations; he inflicted a heavy defeat on Russians in the Russo-Japanese war; he broke the 'hypnotism' of 'color.' He proved how 'wrong' were the Western thinkers who conveniently believed with Hegel that Asia was doomed to be dominated by Europe.

One of the latest illustrations of what students can do is supplied by recent happenings in China. British diplomacy, as some of you may know, favoured Japan at the expense of China: Shantung was snatched from China and given over to Japan. There was an agitation in Peking. The Chinese officials were 'influenced'; it was hoped the agitation would die out.

But no influence or intimidation could extinguish the patriotic fire in the hearts of some

CHINESE STUDENTS

They resolved that the Chinese officials who had sold their country for gold should go they resolved that China must not sign the Peace treaty they resolved that until justice was done to China Japanese goods must be boycotted They were asked by their school masters not to meddle with matters 'political' they were denied sympathy by the rich and powerful some of them were fired upon by the police some of them were arrested and imprisoned They were not cowed down persecution gave a new life to the student movement the students won the sympathy of shop keepers they organised *hartals* they organised big Conferences students boys and girls carried on a vigorous campaign of boycott against Japanese goods What you will ask me have they achieved? More than there is time to tell They compelled the Cabinet to resign and China did not sign the Peace treaty They influenced the merchants and Japanese goods were boycotted They organised National Education Conference They have spread the message of Marx and Plato to thousands of villages they have started several students journals They have opened several centres of social service They have created a new intellectual revolution among the masses and their movement—the Student Movement—is secure to day against all repression and can not be crushed

I have spoken to you of the students and young men of different countries that you may know that you

too and others such as you, the students of Sind, can do much for India at this hour of India's need. And in order that you may serve her in the coming days, I ask you to be in touch with the shop-keepers, the peasants; the masses. My charge against the current system of education is—it isolates you ;

IT SEPARATES YOU

from them ; it does not bind you with them in a common life. Them Bharata needs in the coming days ; and I ask you to realise your unity with them, to give them modern knowledge, to learn of them the wisdom of life enshrined in the old books recited by them but unknown to you. Some of you, I am glad, take interest in the local Night School. We need many Night Schools in Sind ; but we need them to *obliterate* not *emphasise* conventional distinctions ; we need them as *bonds of unity* not as *walls of separation* between one class and another. They have in Paris what is called the *Ecole Socialiste*, a Social School ; and one beautiful thing about it is that labourers and College-students sit together there ; and to bring them together, eminent lecturers like Bergson are invited to give evening addresses at the School. I want you, students to sit together with the poor Labourers in your Night School ; sit with them in your reading room and library ; talk to them and mix with them and make them feel you are their friends. They need you, you need them, in the Service of the Nation.

I want you, young men, to visit villages in parties during your vacations. I want you to meet peasants and labourers and

SPEAK TO THEM OF SWARAJ

and of the modern prophets of freedom. I want you to create an intellectual and national awakening in every village in India. But we are so few, you say; Don't think of it, I say; only have faith in your powers; and you will work wonders. In a recent English poem named the "Hounds of Hell" the poet Maasefield gives the story of a country haunted by hounds. A saint goes to face the hounds, he turns back dismayed; he makes a second effort to master the hounds which attack his country. He crosses a stream; he passes into a new world, the heaven world; there he hears the birds talking to the other, he is given the power to understand the language of the birds; he finds they tell of the

DELUSION OF MEN.

That delusion, according to the birds is this:—Men never guess that deep within them stand courage and wisdom and loveliness. My young friends, I have little more to say to you. My message to you, to-night, is the

MESSAGE OF THE BIRDS

in the story. Have faith in yourselves. Break the delusion that students can do little for the nation; Rise above the *maya* which has made you weak. Believe in your powers and your opportunities, Remember that deep within you stand courage and wisdom and loveliness. Servants of the National Cause ask for your help at this hour of the mother's needs. Only have faith in yourselves. Only set free the divine

within you And you will be among those who are to achieve the salvation of Hindusthan.

PROF. VASWANI.

INAUGURAL ADDRESS AT THE GUJRAT NATIONAL UNIVERSITY

I HAVE been responsible for many important deeds during my life-time I have regretted for some while I have been proud of others But I can say without the least exaggeration that the work in hand this moment, can be compared with none I take this to be the most important not because the country is going to ruins, as some say, along that path, but I feel myself unequal to the task. This is not what courtesy makes me speak but it is what my conscience tells me. I would not have made this preface, had I known that this comes simply as an educational problem. It is not merely to impart learning that this institution is started but it is also meant to enable students to solve the bread problem. That makes me enter into comparisons. I feel reeling as it were when I begin comparing this institution with the Gujarat College and other colleges. To me this appears great though some of you may differ. Bricks and mortar may be playing an important part in your comparisons and I acknowledge the superiority of the Gujarat College in these respects. All along the way-I have been thinking of something, which can enable me to make you set aside these standards of judgment. I have not been able to find that something out and hence I find myself in

straits wherein I had never before fallen knowingly or unknowingly I shall not be able to convince you of things that I feel. How can I convince you that this work is great notwithstanding the deficiencies lying therein? But I have that faith and can only wish that God foster such faith in you.

Nor an inch of the land is ours, everything belongs to the Government, even our body. It is doubtful whether we are masters of our own souls. In such a tragic state how can we wait for good building and learned men? I would gladly offer the principalship to a man, who though a man of little parts can convince me that we have lost our souls and our country its valour and splendour. I do not know whether you would accept him as such. And so Mr Gidwani is here. He is a man with high academic qualifications and bright University degrees. But these have not dazzled me. I would like you to change your standards of judgment and make character the test in your new valuations.

But here we have a holy place and that is brought about by coming together of good men from Maharashtra, Sind and Gujarat.

I would first request the ladies and gentlemen present here to bless the movement and wish it success not by mere words but by deeds in sending their sons and daughters to the institution. India has ever helped such institutions financially, progress is never stayed on account of lack of financial support. But I do believe that it is stayed for lack of men, teachers and organisers. It is only a bad workman that quarrels with his tools and the truest is he, who gives the best.

with what he has. I would tell the principal and the professors that only one principle needs guide them here. They are to teach lessons of freedom not by their scholarship but by their sterling character. They are to meet the forces of the Government with their divine peaceful forces. We have to nurse the seed of freedom into a full-grown tree of Swaraj. May God justify my faith in you! I know that I have not the scholarship which is expected in a Chancellor of a University. But I have my faith which has moved me to accept it. I am prepared to live and die for this work; and I accept this high office only because I know that the same feelings actuate you.

Now I turn to the students. I consider it a sin to blame them, because they are one mirror in which the present situation is so faithfully reflected. They are simple things and easy to read. If they lack in virtue the fault is not theirs, but it is that of the parents, teachers and the king. How do I find fault with the king? "Yatha praja Tatha Raja" (as are the subjects, so is the king), is equally true as "Yatha Raja Tatha Praja" (as is the king so are the subjects), for a king is a king so long as his authority is respected. People are at fault and their drawbacks are mirrored in the students, and hence we must try to reform parents, teachers and kings. Every home is a university and the parents are the teachers. The parents in India have at present foregone this sacred duty. We have not been able to estimate foreign culture at its proper value. How can we expect India to rise with that borrowed culture?

We inaugurate this University not as an educational

institution but as a national one. We inaugurate it to inculcate character and courage in students; and our fitness for Swaraj will be rated by this our success.

THIS is not the time for words but for deeds and I have called upon you to contribute your quota to the national sacrifice. Now I address myself to the students. I do not regard them as mere students exempt from any responsibility. I regard the students who have joined this institution as examples to others and hence fulfilling the conditions of teachers to some extent. The Mahavidyalaya is founded on them without them it would have been an impossibility. They realise its responsibility, and unless they realise this, all the efforts of the teachers will not bear fruits expected of them. They are to fully realise why they have left their colleges and joined this. May God pour into them the strength to discharge their duties during this grim struggle, however long it lasts.

THIS strength of conviction and not the strength in number would make this institution a success and an ideal to the rest of India. It shall be so not because of the wealth of Gujarat or its learning but because it is the birthplace of Non-Co-operation. The ground was first prepared in Gujarat and the seed sown. It is Gujarat that has suffered the birth-pangs and it is Gujarat that has reared up the movement. It is not vanity that speaks in me. I do not mean to say that I am the author of all this. I have simply been a Rishi, a Seer, if a India like myself can be one. I have simply given the idea and it is worked out by my colleagues. Their faith is of a superior type. I have seen it, by experience as directly as I see the trees

opposite, that India is to rise by non-violent Non-Cooperation, and even the gods cannot convince me otherwise. But my colleagues have realised this by imagination, by reasoning, by faith. Individual experience is not the only factor in an action. Faith and imagination do play their part.

My colleagues have grounded the weapon and its effect cannot be fully realised at this moment as it will be six months hence. But its corporate symbol is this Mahavidyalaya. The Chancellor, the teachers, and the students form the component parts of the symbol. I am an autumnal leaf on the tree that might fall off at any moment, the teachers are the young sprouts that would last longer but fall off at their proper time, but you, the students, are the branches that would put forth new leaves to replace the old ones. I request the students to have the same faith in teachers as they have in me. But if you find them lack in vitality, I would ask you to burn them in your fire of righteousness. Such is my prayer to God and that is my blessing to the students.

In conclusion, I pray to God and I wish you to join me in the prayer that this Mahavidyalaya help us to win the freedom that would turn not only this country but the world into a heaven.

MAHATMA GANDHI.

NON-CO-OPERATION AND IDEAL OF NATIONAL EDUCATION.

(Bombay Presidency Students' Federation.)

I WISH to come before you as a fellow student, not as a teacher and preceptor and desire to find out, with your help, what national education in India really implies. My subject to-day is simply this—"National Education."

More and more, thoughtful men and women in India have become aware that the system of Government and Government aided schools and colleges, which has held the field for more than fifty years, has failed,—grievously, lamentably failed. I have had my own bitter experience, within that system, as a learner and a teacher. For a long time, I tried to write and to speak all I could in favour of that system, and as a believer in that system. But little by little, I came to understand, that it produced an atmosphere of servitude, not of freedom, of barrenness, not of fruitfulness, of foreign, not of indigenous culture. Little by little I came to realise, how deadening that atmosphere of servitude was to the soul. I saw students, with bright intelligent faces becoming more and more lifeless and inert, appearing more and more lacking in initiative and self-reliance. It is indeed a shame to me to have to confess to you, that, among the hundreds of pupils who have come under my care in the ten years that I was working in Delhi, there are very few indeed to-day who have learnt the qualities which make education a living power. Very few have acted out in their lives the things that they were

taught from their hooks. Those who have really done so, have for the most part gone outside India and owe their higher character and spirit of initiative and enterprise to the later and entirely new education which they received in America or England or elsewhere, where life was not lived in subjection.

Let me give one single instance, out of a thousand, to show in what bondage we have been held in India. When Lala Lajpat Rai was suddenly deported, in the year 1907, I expressed very strongly indeed to my own students in St Stephen's College, Delhi, what indignation I felt at such tyrannical act. This action by mine was reported in the newspapers, and great exception was taken to it by the Punjab Government. I went still further, and on Lala Lajpat Rai's release, in November of the same year, I heartily encouraged the student's own desire to illuminate the College, and we had a brilliant festival of lamps. For acting in this manner, I was definitely told, that the Government seriously contemplated withdrawing their grant from the College. The warning was given to me; again and again, that such things were impossible in India, I replied.—“How on earth, then, can, the students *live*? How on earth can the students *breathe*?” The reply to these questions was as definitely as possible officially declared in the notorious Risley Circular, which insisted that teachers should not be permitted to discuss current politics with their own pupils.

In this same year, there was a strike at the M. A. O. College, at Aligarh, on account of the conduct of some of the European professors. The whole College was in a state of suppressed meeting and revolt. One

morning, two of the noblest friends I have ever had in my life —Maulavi Nazir Ahmad and Munshi Zaba-llah,—came to me and asked me, with tears in their eyes, to go down with them to Aligarh, in order to help to save the M A O College from utter disaster. I went down with them. Soon after my arrival, a College meeting was held. One of the English Professors implored me to stay in his own bungalow, while he was away at the meeting. I could not quite understand his meaning, but while I was seated reading a copy of "Punch" in an arm chair I heard the tramp, tramp, tramp, of armed men and found that about fifty police, armed with rifles and bayonets, had surrounded the bungalow. The English Professor had called them in, because he had been in fear, that his house would be attacked in his absence by his own students! Could there possibly be a more degrading situation for a teacher to be in than that. It was equivalent in my own mind to a disbelief in the good faith of the Indian people.

When we were departing to Delhi, I asked the Maulvi Sahib what advice he had been able to give to the students, who had been so incensed that they had burnt all their furniture and books. He had said to me,—“I told them that they were not free men, but slaves. If they were free men, they might act as free men; but now, as things were, the only thing was for them to go back into their slavery.” I said, “Maulvi Sahib, that is terrible advice.” He said bitterly,—“Yes, but it is true.”

In after years, I came to know how much true, than I supposed at the time, the advice of the Maulvi

Sahib was, when I came to discover in my own mind the seed of servility beginning to grow up. With all my might, I tried to tear them out by the roots. I tried to speak and to act of a free man. But all this only drove me more and more, every day, out of the Government system of education. At last I came to Bolpur, and I have been there at Shantiniketan,—our “Abode of Peace,—for nearly seven years, untrammelled by any Government restraints and untempted by any Government doles and grants. The only nuisance, which I cannot get rid of is the ubiquitous and perpetual espionage of the C. I. D. ! I had found these light fingered gentry, prying into my private correspondence, when at Delhi ; I had found them even suborning and bribing my own students to spy upon me and upon their fellow undergraduates.

Even the peace of Shantiniketan is sometimes disturbed by their presence. And when I go abroad, I am still often shadowed like a common thief or pickpocket. But this price is small and insignificant to pay in return for the precious heritage of freedom itself, which I have found in the national institution at Bolpur, in such an overflowing measure.

I cannot tell you, therefore, with what joy I have welcomed the Non-Co-operation Movement on its constructive side when it came boldly up to these Colleges in bonds and said to them “Be free !” I am not a politician, and I have no intention of taking part in the National Congress at Nagpur ; but as an ardent educationalist I can wish “God speed” with all my heart to this new constructive enthusiasm which is already raising out of bondage schools and

colleges, making them self-dependent, self governing and entirely free from all government control "God speed" be with every such endeavour! Such is heart felt prayer!

I turn to one further aspect of national education in India. It is on this and this alone, that I shall have time to dwell upon to day. The true education of ancient India in the time of her higher aspirations, was not given amid the paraphernalia of great ugly buildings and cumbersome furniture, costing fabulous sums of money, but in the natural school rooms of the forest ashrams, underneath the shady trees and in thatched mud cottages. Outwardly, there was every sign of poverty. But inwardly, there were reached, in those very forest schools, some of the highest flights of human thought to which mankind has ever attained. The ideal of the Brahmachari Ashram, the ideal of the forest hermitage, is not a dead ideal of the past. It is the very secret, so I fervently believe of India's true national greatness in Education. It is the secret which must be learnt afresh in the days of freedom and enlightenment which are now dawning. We must revive his ideal of simplicity which has been snatched away from us by the West. The West has brought in its place a vulgar ideal,—the ideal of bigness, the ideal of power. That is not the ancient ideal of either India, or China, or Japan. Believe me,—I speak as a convert in this, who has been converted from this false religion of material Europe, this worship of bigness and power, believe me, believe me, Europe herself and America also, will each in turn have to bow their heads and to become humble as little children

if they are to enter into that Kingdom of heaven of learning in all its beauty and truth

If you have followed the course of history, if you have traced the beginnings of each and all of those religious movements, which have left their mark upon Indian history, one by one in turn you will find this striking fact. *It was in the age of deepest poverty and sacrifice and renunciation, that the torch of learning burnt brightest through the night of human darkness.* He was in the pure simple renunciation of the forest life, that the eternal truths of unfaired lands were given to manhood. Later on, it was, in those Buddhist monasteries of Nalanda and Taxila and countless other places that the priceless ethical wisdom of ancient India was lived and studied and taught. And if we come later down the stream of history to Islam we find again the same thing. What period in Islam is more glorious, in its living truth, than the days of the Prophet himself and of Abu Baker and the earliest Musalman believers, when they were living as one brotherhood of love amid the barest outward poverty of the Arabian desert? And again,—to turn for one moment to the West,—the Dark Ages of Europe themselves were illuminated by the learned saintly monks of the Benedictive and Cistercian Orders who worked and studied and prayed, in their poverty and renunciation. And again the name of learning burnt bright, making one of the greatest after-effects of that Franciscan movement, which started with Poverty as its Bride, following the example of Jesus of Nazareth, who was the poorest of the poor and had not where to lay his head.

The lesson is true to day—true in the very midst of 'big business, mammoth industrialism millionaire capitalism side by side with sweated misery and vice and crime and shame—the lesson is true to day that in simplicity and in simplicity alone can national education in India be truly founded. The Bramha charya Ashram in its ideal of poverty and purity and renunciation must be restored if our learning to day in India is to be worthy of the source from whence it sprang.

These then are some of the lessons that I have been learning as a student at Shantiniketan. These are the things that I have been finding out through my own personal experience. It is these lessons in pure freedom pure simplicity pure renunciation which I long with all of you my fellow students to see once more restored to the Motherland.

Bande Mataram Bande Mataram Bande Mataram

C F ANDREWS

DUTY OF STUDENTS

(Wellington Square Calcutta)

MAHATMA GANDHI began by addressing the audience as fellow students as he thought that though he read in no college whether national or affiliated to universities established under the aegis of the Government every reasonable being ought to remain a student throughout his life. The President and the other two speakers who preceded him told the audience to come to a final decision in the matter of withdrawal from

schools and colleges that very evening. The speaker desired to disabuse their mind of any such idea. He desired that the students should not come to any decision that evening. He desired to appeal to their intellect and not to their emotion. Instead of wishing them to come to any decision that very evening, he wanted them to retire to their closets and be on their knees and then seek and follow the guidance of God. Mahatma Gandhi tried to make it clear that his message was not to those who did not believe in an Almighty Power who guides all our steps.

Coming to the subject-matter of the present lecture, Mahatma Gandhi said that the task was no small one. We are face to face with a situation such as had never been faced probably at any time throughout the long period of British occupation. The British Government had stabbed Islam in the back. It was common knowledge, that Mr. Lloyd George had made a solemn promise to Indian Mussalmans, a promise which was repeated by him to Moslems generally and Indian Moslems in particular more than once guaranteeing the integrity of the Turkish Sovereignty. That promise Mr. Lloyd George has gone back upon and dispossessed the Turkish Sultan of Constantinople, Thrace, Smyrna and all the fair lands of Asia Minor. It may be said by some that Constantinople is in the possession of the Turks but the Sultan is a prisoner in Constantinople even in his own Kingdom. His territory of Mesopotamia is in the hands of the British and Syria is in the occupation of the French. So long as this wound remained unhealed, it would go on festering in the heart of Islam.

and if the Hindus want to do their duty by their Mussalman-brothers; they ought to stand by the latter in their hour of trial. Similarly the British Government has stabbed the heart of India through the Punjab and yet that Government is unrepentant and ask India to forget the wrongs and plead helpless in the matter of the Turkish treaty. The question before them now is whether the Indians could consistently with their self-respect and dignity continue to associate with a Government which is responsible for the Punjab atrocities and the Turkish treaty and under whose ægis innocent men has been killed.

It is for India to make her choice. I freely confess that if these two wrongs did not stir them, the whole case for non-co-operation would go. They can not retain their title to be called a nation if they continue to be associated with such a Government. You can not co-operate so long as these wrongs remain unrighted. Two courses are open to a people so distressed (1) either to draw the sword or (2) to non-co-operate with the Government. The whole of India has admitted her powerlessness to draw the sword. With myself, to draw the sword is a sin, though with the majority of the Muhammadans, and a considerable body of the Hindus, not to draw it is a matter of policy. It was a recognized fact that, to draw the sword was an impossibility. What could we do then with a Government subduing 300 millions of men with one lac of English soldiers?

Another question is how do the Government hold India under subjection? This Government, would tatter

to pieces immediately if all co-operation was withdrawn. So long as we co-operated with the Government through the law-courts, councils, and schools, our three mayas or hallucinations, so long as we believe in our helplessness without any law-courts to administer Justice, and Councils to legislate for us, so long as we think ourselves helpless with regard to education without institution controlled by the Government with which we co-operate either by patronising it or submitting to its discipline so long we are slaves. The question before the students is a question of duty. You can not be said to be drawn to the performance of your duty unless you are prepared to face starvation of education. The question before you is very simple—are you or are you not disgusted with the feelings of domination that prevail in these schools? Are you filled from top to toe with the disaffection not to have anything to do with such a Government? The case of the speaker is sufficiently simple. If there is no national consciousness, if there is no sense of national self-respect, his whole case for non-co-operation falls to the ground. Here is an illustration from the Boer War. When President Kruger threw down the challenge to the British Government every student withdrew from schools and no provision was made for their study. On the other hand they were found to be fighting in the trenches or helping the wounded on the battle-field. They did not consider that their minds would be starved by such discontinuance of studies. How did Oxford, Cambridge and the Inns of court send out their students during the war.

they not go to fight in the trenches? The speaker said that he himself formed an ambulance corps for relieving the sick and the wounded from among these students for which his services were gratefully acknowledged by the very Government with which he now found it impossible to co-operate. Did these students make any terms before they came out. All were fired with one ambition *viz.* to defeat the enemy. The stake before India to-day is the same as the stake before England on that occasion, England was fighting for life, for honour. She was ready to sacrifice all because there was salt upon the honour of England. Is not India reduced to the same condition? Has India conscience enough to be stung in her heart to be ready for similar sacrifice in order to save these (life and honour) when they are at stake.

He then showed the audience two documents which had been placed in his hands. Students asked him in these letters what they would do after withdrawing from colleges. Medical Students asked where they were to go in that case. To them he said that his message to them was to withdraw completely from schools dominated by a Government because honour demanded it. It was wrong to co-operate with the Government in any way. What would they do after withdrawing? They might break stones, take to scavenging and leansing the stinking stables of India. He would make no promise to or any bargain with the students. It was their duty which could not require any reward. It was a debt to be paid with life. Their reward is to be in heaven and not in this world. The reward which they were to get here is freedom.

Only those students who each time they go to school have a choking sensation, have the right to leave such Government schools. If you think that you improve in your mind if you remain there then you should not come out. If you feel you are evolving freedom by being inside these schools, it is your bounden duty to remain. But you should remain true to your oath, true to the loyalty which you are always presupposed to have for your institution by going to the School or College. But you should never be hypocrites by going there, harbouring disaffection in your mind. Under such circumstances, it would be your bounden duty to withdraw and not only to withdraw but also to proclaim from the house-tops that it is your intention to break the entire system. Once again I repeat that I make no appeal to your emotions only, but to your intellect and heart combined. If you consider it your bounden duty to withdraw from Colleges, you can not remain there for one day more. You can not harbour feelings of revenge and yet to go to these institutions for the present in expectation of some future opportunity. History of course abounded in such deceitful behaviour. Other nations might have resorted to treachery, chichane and fraud but not so the non-co-operation movement which was a purifying process and sought for assistance from God and not from man. The highest sacrifice with the greatest nobility of purpose is the thing required. Consequently it hurt me when I found any to entertain the view that students should continue to go to these institutions and yet harbour ill-will against them and then strike the deathblow when the oppor-

tunity comes. If they retain any spark of the Rishis of old if the Mussalmans retained any respect for the true fakirs who made Islam what it was and read their Koran aright they would find that treachery and dishonesty found no place in their religion. There was no room for camouflage in such a matter. Their battle was nothing but a religious battle. If they employed Satanic methods they were doomed. What then are the students to do? I have already said that I have not come to bargain but I may assure you if you come out in a body national institutions would not be wanting. All the leaders who seem now to be asleep would then wake up and come to establish schools and colleges for these students. That was the case in Guzrat, that was the case in Surat. What was the fault of these leaders? They did not believe in non violent non co operation and so they did not show any enthusiasm. But if all the students come out I do not despair even of Babu Surendra Nath Banerjee. By boycotting such schools and colleges I want them to be self reliant and not merely to go from one slavery to another. I want the students to be absolutely selfreliant and breathe the Ozone of freedom by leading a new life and change their helplessness into self help.

Lastly, the speaker dealt with the duty of the students to their parents. He considered here the case only of those who were over 16 years of age as according to the Hindus boys were then friends of their parents. Mahatma Gandhi said that he could not ask them to disobey their parents wilfully. If you believe that you are right, you should try to persuade them on bended

knees. You should try to convince them what a great wrong has been inflicted on you and there is no parent who would not respect the opinions of the son. The minds of the parents are cast in a certain mould but their minds are so many clean slates. So there might be difference of opinion. But never should they prefer my opinion above the opinions of the parents but if my opinion becomes their own conviction, they are entitled to disobey their parents. He exhorted them again not to be carried away by emotion. It was better that they should remain within than return after coming out in a fit of the moment. Breach of promise and dishonour would be the only result of such hasty action. He asked the students to consider fifty times before taking any steps. They should discuss the situation with their friends, parents, teachers and if they are still convinced of the rightness of their friends, they should withdraw.

If students came out they should not undertake the devotion of those who did not withdraw. Too often had he seen taunts flung at those who remained inside. They must concede that liberty to others which they claimed for themselves. In meetings also they should not adopt western methods of howling down or applauding a speaker. These do not help but merely interrupt the flow of thought. He asked them to give the same attention to every speaker that came before them. They should give undivided attention to the thing as theirs was a business of earnestness. If they wanted to have India free in one year, each should do all that lies within his power. "Not until each man acted, should we be able to free India from the yoke that was

grinding her to dust," said Mahatma in concluding his stirring address which was heard with rapt attention

MAHATMA GANDHI.

STUDENT'S DUTY AT THE PRESENT CRISIS

(Dacca)

It is difficult for me to resist the word of a friend and a dear co-worker I was so thoroughly bound up with my Hindi and with my theme that I was hoping to be able to finish the whole of my remarks in Hindustanee. But I am helpless Mr Das suggests that I should speak on the topic of the students in English. I do so not without some degree of pain, but I do so also not without pleasure—pleasure, because I satisfy his desire, pain because I am compelled to make my meaning clear to you through medium which is foreign both to you and to me I am explaining to the students their clearest possible duty I am explaining to the students if you, the students, have understood the purport of my remark and if you feel with me that this Government of ours is dominated by the spirit of Satan, if you feel with me that the net result of the activities of our Government is to tighten the bonds of slavery rather than to lessen them, if you feel with me that to lay our slavery is stronger than ever and if you feel with me that in order to vindicate the self-respect of the Punjabee, in order to vindicate the honour of Islam you and I should do something, then I say to the students of Dacca, consider your own immediate duty. Imagine

that Satan had established schools and seminaries for the instruction of Indian youths, imagine that you had a choice between allowing your intellect and your heart to remain virgin and between attending the seminaries and the colleges established by Satan. Imagine also that the youths of India are possessed with the fear of God, that you are all believing men, that you have faith in God and that you believe in the righteousness of godhead, imagine all these things and tell me whether you will choose rather to remain without any instruction or whether you will choose to go and attend the seminaries and colleges established by Satan. And if your answer is positively in favour of leaving Satan's Colleges and schools then I tell you, I suggest to you that my case is absolutely complete. My own position is that this Government in its nakedness is dominated by the spirit of Satan and if you want to be dominated by the spirit of God, if you want to establish the kingdom of Heaven in India, if you want, that is to say, to establish what Swarajya is, in India, it is your bounden duty to leave these colleges and schools without any condition whatsoever. Because the instruction that you receive in these schools and colleges is not the instruction that will give you Swaraj, this is not the instruction which a man ought to receive who desires freedom or liberty. It is a slave-owning state and do you imagine that a slave-owning state can possibly give you education in such a manner that you can break down the shackles that bind you in slavery? I have never yet known a slave owner teaching his slave the price of freedom, the price of liberty. Wherever slaves have enfranchised themselves, they have done

feel that you cannot tolerate this Government for one moment, honour demands, self-respect of India demands that you leave these Colleges and schools to-morrow. You must not harbour disaffection and dishonourable means in those schools and colleges. You must not say that you go to these schools in order to demolish this Government. In my opinion it would be disloyalty. It is not disloyalty of the Penal Code. It is not manufactured disloyalty but it is disloyalty in accordance with the eternal laws of God. If you go to these schools and colleges established by the Government you should go to these schools and colleges with a clean heart. 'Imagine the Governor attends the school, you have got to stand up.' You have got to sing—'God save King George.' As an Englishman, and we as gentlemen can pray to God to save King George but we cannot with a clear conscience cry out 'God save the King' of this kingdom. That is the meaning—God save this kingdom. Does it mean, that the present ruler who sits in England in the Buckingham Palace may remain alive for eternity? But it means that this British Empire in which the sun never sets may remain for ever, till eternity. And if you, the youths of India, the future hope of India on whom the foundation of the nation rests, if you feel with me that it is not possible for you to get up to honour the Governor in virtue of his office when he attends your schools and colleges, it is not possible for you to get up when 'God save the King' is struck up in schools, then I say, do not go to these schools and colleges. You will be false to your traditions and you will be false to India's past.

lectures Then the case is still worse on the part of those who hiss him out of the stage It is necessary for you to listen with attention to every speaker It is necessary on our part that we should trust every speaker

We ought to have sufficient freedom in ourselves to form our own judgment We shall not be able to lead this nation to the promised goal unless we are capable of shifting wheat from chaff unless we are able to distinguish between error of judgment and wise advice unless we are able to exercise our faculty of discrimination But let us not forget ourselves, and insult a speaker who stands up on the platform I give you one recipe which I said to the Gujrat students If you believe that a particular speaker is insincere even then you are not entitled to hiss him you are not entitled to show any disrespect to him But you are entitled to leave him You are entitled to leave the stage and leave the audience When the students hissed Mrs Besant it cut me to the quick I feel that these students who claimed to be non co operationists had done the highest disservice to the cause and had done something which was disgraceful on their part from the Non co operator's stand point I suggested to them that if they did not wish to listen to Mrs Besant—if they found that Mrs Besant's remark irritated them if they found that she did not do justice to the cause they were entitled to withdraw from the stage but they were not entitled to show disregard to a venerable lady

Youngmen of Dacca I ask you to join the banner
 ' Non co operation Understand please that this is

a battle of self-purification, it is a call upon you to exercise common self-restraint—it is a call upon you to exercise your own judgment and not slavishly to follow any body else. I ask you not to follow the judgment of others. 'If you feel, if your heart endorses what I am saying to you and if you can assimilate what I say to you then and then only you are justified in leaving your schools and colleges. If you feel, what I have said it, would be your sacred duty—because your parents may not endorse what I have said—even respectfully to disobey them if they call upon you not to leave these schools and colleges. But the condition of this disobedience is perfect civility, perfect self-restraint and not dishonouring your parents. If I know the parents of India, I know that you the youths of India will be able even to persuade your parents in the granting of permission to leave your schools and colleges if you are in earnest. I think that the parents of India will have a perfect right to warn you against leaving your schools and colleges being carried away by the eloquence of an indifferent and good speaker. 'You have been in the habit of being carried away off your feet. Therefore if your parent warns you, think fifty times. It is wise

I ask you young Indians if you hold with me that this is a sacred duty to leave these schools and colleges unconditionally you are to do so at once. But you must pray to your God confining yourself within your closets and see whether it is the voice of clear conscience. And if you are satisfied then check yourself by going to your parents—by going to your elders and your teachers and if still you remain unconvinced and if you feel

that you must leave these schools and colleges, then consistently with full regard for your parents it is your sacred duty to leave these schools and colleges. This is the command of the Hindu Sastra. This is the command of the holy Koran. If you are satisfied you will have no hesitation in leaving your schools and colleges.

One thing more and I have done. You want new schools and colleges in place of the old. I am aware of that. Whilst I ask you to leave these schools and colleges unconditionally I know that the duty rests upon the leaders to establish schools and colleges and they shall do what is best for you. But I ask you to have sufficient faith in yourself. I want you to have sufficient faith in your leaders. You will have to create the want and immediately the leaders are sure that you do not want to go to the established schools and colleges that are affiliated to the Universities that very moment you will find them providing institutions for you. May God give you strength. May God give you health. May God give you faith to see your path quite clear.

MAHATMA GANDHI

TO THE ALIGARH PARENTS

I know that the best of my friends are bewildered at many of my doings at the present moment, not the least among which is my advice to the youth of the country. I do not wonder at their bewilderment. I have undergone a complete transformation in my attitude towards the system of Government under which we are labouring. But my friends are not so convinced as I am of the supreme necessity of ending

this system unless it undergoes a radical change and there is definite repentance on the part of the rulers

I share too your concern about your boys who are learning at Aligarh. You will believe me when I tell you that I do not wish to hurt your feelings. I am myself the father of four boys whom I have brought up to the best of my lights. I have been an extremely obedient son to my parents and an equally obedient pupil to my teachers. I know the value of filial duty. But I count duty to God above all these. And in my opinion the time has come for every young man and young woman in this country to make their choice between duty to God and duty to others. I claim to know the youth of our country in a fairly intimate manner. I know that in the majority of cases the youth of our country have the determining of their higher education in their own hands. I know cases in which parents find it difficult to wean their children from what to them (the parent) appears to be the infatuation of their children about higher education. I am convinced that I am doing no violence to the feelings of parents when I address our young men and ask them leave their schools or colleges even in spite of their parents. You will not be astonished to learn that, of the parents of hundreds of boys who have left schools or colleges I have received only one protest that from a government servant whose boys have left their college. The protest is based on the ground that they were not even consulted before their boys decided to leave their college. In fact my advice to the boys was even to discuss with their parents the question of leaving before arriving at a decision.

I have myself appealed to thousands of parents at scores of meetings at which hardly a parent has objected to the proposition of leaving government controlled schools. Indeed they have with wonderful unanimity passed resolutions on non-co-operation including the item on schools. I therefore take leave to think that the parents of the Aligarh boys are no less convinced than the others of the necessity of withdrawing their children from schools and colleges supported or controlled by a government that has participated in betraying the Masulmans of India and has wantonly humiliated the nation through its barbarous treatment of the Punjab.

I hope you know that I am as eager as any that our boys education should not be neglected. But I am certainly more eager that their education is received through clean hands, I hold it to be unmanly for us to continue to receive grants for our education from a government which we heartily dislike. In my humble opinion that would be even dishonourable and disloyal.

Is it not better that our children would receive their education in a free atmosphere, even though it may be given in humble cottages or in the shade of trees and under teachers who being themselves free, would breathe into our children the spirit of freedom? I wish you could realise that the destiny of our beloved land lies not in us, the parents but in our children. Shall we not free them from the curse of slavery which has made us crawl on our bellies? Being weak, we may not have the strength or even the will. But shall we not have the wisdom not to leave the cursed inheritance to our children?

They can lose nothing by pursuing their studies as free lads and lasses. Surely they do not need Government University degrees. And if we could but get rid of the love of Government degrees for our boys the question of finding money for their education is in reality simple. For a week's self-denial by the nation will provide for the education of its school-going children for one year. Our existing religious and charitable Hindu and Muslim funds can support our education without even a week of self-denial. The present effort is no more than an attempt to take a referendum of our capacity to govern ourselves and to protect our religions and our honour.

MAHATMA GANDHI

TO THE BOMBAY STUDENTS

MR. GANDHI addressing the audience as brothers and sisters said he was not going to give them a *kinder-garten* lesson that evening, but would try to convince them of some thing important. First of all he wanted to tell the students that he did not want those students to boycott schools and colleges, who could not refrain from hissing a speaker whose views differed from theirs. That was *asatya*. It would not be wrong to disobey even parents in the matter of boycott of schools and colleges after attaining *satya* and purifying their inner-selves. Those who could stoop to act against their conscience were not fit to adopt the principle of Non-co-operation. As long as they were not able to purify their inner-selves and abide by their conscience they were unfit for Non-co-operation. After becoming

Brahmacharees, and after attaining to the right patch of self-restraint they could even disobey their parents. There would be nothing wrong in it if they disobeyed their parents at the dictation of their conscience.

Those, who hissed at the Excelsior Theatre the other day, acted against their conscience and they would soon repent for that. As for Mr. Nimbkar, he was sure, that Mr. Nimbkar would express his regret in public in no time, because he knew that he had done something wrong. Until the students realized the principles of non-violence and non-hatred, they would be able to do no service to their motherland which they genuinely loved. I ask you to remember that our non-co-operation is "non-violent non-co-operation." This non-co-operation has no similarity with the non-co-operation movement of Ireland or of Egypt, though the motive was nearly the same. I do not like to adopt such method in India. Both Ireland and Egypt preached violence while I am against it. The use of the sword, or force or abuse against an opponent is morally equally culpable and they all amounted to violence. In India they can not use any of these devices for it is against the nature and religion of Indians to abuse an opponent. It is an act of violence to abuse an opponent, and so long as you would use violence the goal of *Swaraj* would be remote from us.

NATURE OF THE PRESENT GOVERNMENT.

The second thing, I want to tell you, is that this present Government is based on the worst principles. Their rulers had first cheated us and are now trying to quiet us by so many honeyed and false statements.

After the massacre in the Punjab they had even to-day Lord Chelmsford at the head of the Government of their country and O'Dwyer in a high position. No man can conscientiously co-operate with such a Government. If the Britishers sincerely admitted their mistake and begged their pardon Indians would have forgiven them unhesitatingly. But instead of doing that they are adding fuel to the fire by flagrantly breaking the responsible pledge given to the Indian Mahomedans. Of late they have asked the Indians to forget the unfortunate tragedy but even now they do not show an attitude of repentance nor do they admit their fault in clear terms.

I ask you if it is not sufficient to show that our Government is a callous Government and whether it is not right on our part to boycott all schools and colleges controlled by such Government. The late Lokmanya Tilak had explained to you more than once from that very platform how wicked minded our Government was.

NON CO OPERATION—THE ONLY REMEDY

Continuing, Mr. Gandhi said there were some who said that it was a folly to withdraw students from the Government colleges without making sufficient provision for National colleges and schools. But when a man see a snake under his bed will he look out for another bed before leaving the former one? The speaker advised the students to leave schools and colleges without bothering themselves unduly about the future. In his opinion the idea of pass-

and M A with the hope of obtaining services was also greatly responsible for their present slavery

Concluding Mr Gandhi told them that the present universities and colleges had produced more slaves than scholars. No they must destroy these slave producing institutions and the only measure was non co operation with the Government and the boycott of their institutions, But he again reminded them that their non co operator must be non violent. If they could all become non violent non co operators then Swaraj would be within their reach within a year

MAHATMA GANDHI

THE STUDENTS DUTY

I HAVE been watching not only the minds of our youthful population but also of the elders of the community for the last week or so. And the one thing that has come to my mind over and over again is this—namely that there seems to me—I may be right or I may be wrong. I hope and believe I am right—it seems to me that the political life of Bengal is just now lamentably lacking in a little imagination. Some one said I forget his name just now—he is an Englishman—he said that imagination has no place in politics. I think it was said somewhere in India but the man who said it had no understanding of what true politics is. There is a kind of politics which is moved by the considerations of immediate result which is moved by expediency which seeks an immediate end and leaves the future near or distant in the hands of gods. That is very

much characterised as political improvidence, political thriftlessness. Real statesmanship tries to picture 'the future,' long before it is materialised and they regulate their present policy with a view to meet the requirements of that distant future and in the exercise of his truly statesman-like qualities imagination, not fancy, plays a very important part, and why I refer to it to-day is : I ask you to try to exercise a little imagination, try to put yourself so far as you may do so in the place of those who have uncontrolled and irresponsible political authority over you to-day. I want you to place yourselves in the position of the Governor of this Province. Is he sleeping well ? Ask yourselves this question. You are doing nothing. Only 500 and odd 'youngmen,' some say, they are hurting themselves and hurting no one else. They have left their books. They have come out of their colleges. What does it matter to the August Ruler of this great province supported by the physical prowess of a great Empire. Some people think in that way. I have some little faith in the power of imagination of Lord Ronaldshay and I believe he is not just now thinking in this way. I believe Lord Chelmsford (cries of shame shame) is not thinking in this way. I mean, he is having sleepless nights. Why cry shame on him ' Lord Chelmsford is not thinking in that way. I believe His Royal Highness the Duke of Connaught who is now in Madras is not feeling the position so easy as he might have thought it to be at one time when he read in the morning papers of this great strike of the youngmen of Bengal. They are the most inflammable because they are the most idealistic of the youths of modern India (hear, hear).

They proved their mettle by passing through the baptism of fire during the Swadeshi agitation of the last decade. It has been said that that agitation failed. Is it so? (Cries of no, no) Those who assess its value by the outer material results may do so but I for one assess national as well as personal values not by material but by moral standard. If that movement had been such a miserable failure why I do not believe you, youngmen of Calcutta have come out of your colleges in your thousands to day. That inspiration still lives in Bengal and the sufferings of the hands of youngmen have not been in vain. You are the inheritors of the experience the pains the sufferings the sacrifice and devoted patriotism of those hands of immortal Bengali youngmen (loud cries of hear, hear) whom the Swadeshi movement called into being.

We have been told that the National Educational movement of the last decade failed. Yes it failed. So far as an educational movement it failed. But not by one jot or tittle that movement failed as a patriotic movement for the emancipation of the country. As an educational movement it fails—Why? Because the National Educational movement of the last decade was taken in hand by eminent educationists brought up under the Calcutta University. I have no desire to belittle what this Calcutta University has done for Bengal. But that University gave us the men who guided and controlled the National Education movement in Bengal and the result was they could not offer a scheme of education very much different from much less superior to the education which was given in those days. The only education which the National

Council of Education in Bengal gave which was not a reproduction of the education of the Calcutta University was the education given by the technical department of the Bengal National College and technical department has done yeoman's service to the cause of practical technical education in Bengal during the last fifteen years

I am reading in some newspaper this morning that the boys who left their schools and colleges during the last upheaval are repenting of their folly. They have been useless in life. Have they? (Cries of no no) Thank you. Here is one youngman who I believe is a product of the National School. Look about you who are the leaders of some of the new industries in Bengal to day. Look at the techno chemical Laboratory. These youngmen are the fruits of National education of the last decade. There are others who are doing excellent work not in Government service. They gave up all hope of Government service when they joined the National Institution ten or fifteen years ago. But in industry in trade in other departments of life their life has not been a failure. Some have suffered but I will not do them the injustice and believe that they are repenting for the sacrifice they made for the emancipation of the Motherland. That movement did not fail. It has left its legacy in you gentlemen.

Apart from that this time Swaraj has come as I told you the other day within hailing distance. I see it is clear as day light. At this time if—I will not say cent per cent—but if 90 per cent nay if 60 per cent of the college going youngmen of India come out of their

Colleges not only in Calcutta, but at Bankipur, at Berhampore and from all the Districts of Bengal—from Allahabad and Lucknow and other places in the U. P. from Madras and Bombay—if 60 per cent of the College-going youngmen of India come out and stand on the road with no desire to do anything else but with the express and deathless determination to do nothing either in the educational or in any other departments until and unless Swaraj is attained (hear, hear) assured—if you do that, I have not the least little doubt that some sort of a compromise—some sort of reconciliation will come from the Government on the other side—I have no doubt that some announcement which will render the attainment of Swaraj inevitable in the course of 3, 4 or 5 years will come from His Royal Highness the Duke of Connaught. Therefore I want you to come out. I do not care if you have to suspend your studies in the meantime. Mr Das is a practical man—I have never dealt with practical affairs—if he tells you that he will give you a College, I know he will. But if I were you I would not care for the college just now.

I believe three months will be quite sufficient to induce, to compell the other party and make things easy for you and me. Three months will be quite enough. Somebody was telling me of its effect upon the Government. Has not it? And these 5,000 youngmen—who are they? Everyone of these youngmen if they stick to their determination will be looked upon by the Government as a high moral explosive as a tremendous moral bomb—not a bomb that is made of picric acid but a bomb that is made of something

far more powerful than any explosive that the Prussians had been able to invent and the English had been able to imitate. It is the will, the deathless determination to freedom the will to freedom that will strike terror into the hearts of those who are trying to stand up to exercise the will to subjection. The conflict is between the will to freedom and the will to subjection. The conflict is between virtue and sin, because freedom is virtue subjection is sin. The conflict is between the power of light and life and the power of darkness and death and you who know sufficiently of human history and evolution of national destinies and believe in this conflict between the will of a people to freedom and the will of the oppressors to subjection, know that ultimately it is the will to freedom which wins. It has been so all over the world. It was so in England in the days before Cromwell. It was so in America in the days of Washington. It was so in Italy in the days of Mazzini. Alas, poor Mazzini. You do not understand the agony in my heart when I think of Mazzini. It was he who called out the youths of my generation to come and enlist themselves to fight for the freedom of their country. Mazzini and the history of Italy under Mazzini proves, you will know, against what odds Mazzini and his compatriots had to fight, but ultimately they won. You know against what odds Kossuth had to fight and even he won. The battle for freedom may seem to be losing in the beginning but this losing appearance is meant to call forth greater determination in the fighters for freedom and I have no doubt, my dear friends, that if you stand out for freedom—I do not care—I told my son—that is not the time to study

It is the time to keep yourselves ready to free the Mother country. You talk of reading and passing your examination. Will you tell me if psychology and Mathematics and Biology and Physiology and research scholarships will add one single drop of strength or your desire for freedom of India just now? I am a votary of culture. I respect every scholar. I want you to ransack the stored up knowledge of the world. I want you to build up your national culture on the acquisition of the whole of the human race. I do not belittle knowledge—scientific, historical and literary researches for its own sake but there comes a time in the life of a nation as in the life of an individual. If I was on my death bed, will my son say—"Oh, wait, let me pass my examination." Every moment of his life is necessary to carry and fetch medicine and medical man for me. Can he say "Oh, Let my father remain on the death-bed—let me pass my examination"? Will my son be justified in doing that? Shall I not curse him? That is exactly the situation before you. The country wants you. It is the last chance. Humanely speaking, I positively believe that it is our last chance to win Swaraj. If you fall now you will never win it. The opportunity is grand. Such opportunity comes rarely, once or twice in the life time of a nation, or of a generation. That opportunity has come to you. They are holding their hands.

Did you read what Sir Valentine Chirol wrote to the 'Times' about this movement. He says—"Do not touch it. Remember the Punjab episode. Create no more conflagration." That is the mentality of Sir

Valentine You hear the Master's voice—his master's voice in the voice of Sir Valentine Chirol. He has been commissioned by the ruling classes, the Capitalist ruling classes in Great Britain to come and see with his own eyes and study the situation in India. He has been closetted, I think, with the highest officials here and when he says—do not touch it, do not try to drive this movement of Non-violent Non-co-operation along the lines that culminated in the tragedy of the Punjab last year—when Sir Valentine says that we are to understand a little of the mentality that is working in the official minds in India and England at the present time.

Now is your opportunity. Not five thousand, but tens of thousands of youngmen of India come out and stand for freedom—education or no education. Study may wait but Swaraj cannot. That is my opinion. If you slip this opportunity, you will not get it again in your life-time possibly. Therefore think not of any other thing. Think not of the arrangement that may be made for your education. Think not of anything except this one thing that “we shall come out and stand on the road and declare we want Swaraj.” “We do not want to strike any body. We shall commit no disorder—we commit no violence. But we will not shirk crying from the house tops that we will not wait till Swaraj is attained and we will not stop until we get it.”

When I heard you asking what arrangement has been made for your education, I felt hurt. It is not to give you education that we want to come out. We want you to fight for Swaraj and to do whatever is

necessary to fight for Swaraj and win it. Whatever training, whatever discipline is necessary, God pleasing, will be given to you. You may put that much of confidence—that much of repose in your elders and your friends. But above all depend upon your own selves—Depend upon the ideal Who is this person or that person? Who is C. R. Das? Who is Bipin Chandra Pal? Who are we? We are merely instruments in the hands of a Power—not ourselves that is calling from you this sacrifice. It is the Spirit of India which calls to the youths of India to-day to come out and stand up on your right, do nothing except determination and will to make yourself free. That is what we want. And if you understand this, if you take in this situation you will be troubled with thoughts, what you shall read or where shall you read—who will teach you—what instrument shall you handle in the laboratory.

“Seek ye, first” it is an old sacred saying “the Kingdom of Heaven and all else shall be added unto you.” Seek ye first Kingdom of Swaraj, seek ye first the Freedom of your Nation and all else shall be added unto you. But if you will not seek that, if you will go after this or that kindly light, you will be lost in the intervening gloom. You will lose your soul—you will lose your Future and you shall lose the chance that God has given you for fighting and winning the Freedom of your Nation.

BIPIN CHANDRA PAL

TO THE STUDENTS

Message of freedom

TO DAY I have to repeat the Message of Freedom I have been often asked what is the meaning of this movement To my mind the meaning is particularly clear We want Freedom We want to realise the right of regulating our own lives We want to realise the right of building up the great Indian Nation We want to compel the bureaucracy to recognise that right

It is unnecessary to refer to the past It is not my desire to perpetuate bitterness It is my desire to strengthen our determination to achieve our freedom

I advocate the method of Non co operation as every other method has failed I want you to cling to this method come what may This is our last chance and this at least will not be in vain

Do you understand what Non co operation means ? You must withdraw your help in moving the powerful machinery of the bureaucracy Do you realise how you can move this machinery ? The bureaucracy works its wicked will through the pleaders through doctors through clerks through their police officers and through magistrates and judges And you now see what the Calcutta University contributes It contributes all the strength upon which the strength of the bureaucracy depends

I appeal to you to take away your hands from the wheel of this machinery The first thing therefore is to come out of the Colleges I make no distinction between the Medical students—between the students of the Engineering Colleges and other students The problem is not of education but of Non co-operation

If you have this in view, how can there be any distinction between classes of students? Is it not clear that all students contribute to the strength of the bureaucracy? And is it possible to defeat this bureaucracy without taking away that help? I have heard arguments based on humanitarian grounds, but every humanitarian ground must yield to the supreme necessity of the moment. There is some inconvenience, some apparent want of humanitarian consideration in every great war. Is it possible that this great war, based on peaceful method as it is, should steer clear of all inconveniences? I do not believe that there will be any the more suffering, because of the withdrawal of medical students. I have given it my anxious thoughts and my decision is clear. But even if it does involve great suffering, I should welcome that suffering rather than leave one stone in its place in this edifice of a monstrous Education. No, my dear friends, do not delude yourselves. It is easy to quote Scripture to cover your weakness. Believe me, it is not the humanitarian ground which is keeping you away but the imaginary prospects, worldly advancement which are dangled before your eyes. The method that I advocate is the method of sacrifice. If you have to destroy what you consider your chance of success in life, remember it is only to defeat the bureaucracy and to attain Swaraj. How can Swaraj be attained unless you realise your own right clearly, unhesitatingly? How can you compel the bureaucracy to recognise that which you yourself do not realise?

Do not listen to those who make careful calculations and tell you that this movement is bound to fail. I

warn you against such doubts and hesitations. Even if the students do not realise their rights and their duty, the work of Non co operation will go on. But I admit that you may make it more difficult by refusing to join us.

The Battle of Freedom has never been won in the history of the world without sacrifice. The armed organization of powerful hureaucracies all over the world have made armed resistance well nigh impossible. But the soul is ever free and he who is free in his mind can never be enslaved. I want you to turn away your face from Europe and from the organization which is of European character. I want you to concentrate your vision on the things which truly belong to us. The very simplicity of our life has become difficult of comprehension because of the tortuous and complex organisation which European culture and education have placed before us. Once you, turn your face away from that you will have faith in methods which belong to us in standards which are really part of our blood and of our bones. What is more simple than the desire and the determination to withdraw your help from that which is false and unrighteous? And yet why do you experience such difficulties in forming that desire and in fixing that determination? The answer is again the same, *viz.*, that Monster of Education which is rearing up its head in defiance, as it were, of everything which belongs to us and which is dear to our hearts.

I repeat again—Wake up, wake up, wake up. We have slept too long. Realise the sense of your bondage and stand out boldly and firmly on the road to Freedom.

DESHABANDU CHITTARANJAN

আমাদের প্রকাশিত—

- 1 Non Co operation in other Lands (in the Press)
- 2 Behave Like Men (open letters by Mahatma Gandhi, Lala Lajpat Rabindranath, and others on the present situation)

3 সহযোগীতা বর্জন প্রস্তাব—

ত্ৰিপ্রকাশচন্দ্র মহম্মদাব্বি এম এ বি এল।

স্বরাষ্ট্রের পথে—অসহযোগ—শ্রীঅনিলবাবল্ল রায় এম এ

SARASWATY LIBRARY

7 Rama nath Mazumder Street,
Calcutta

সরস্বতী পুস্তকালয় কর্তৃক প্রকাশিত।

1. রাজনীতি—শ্রীমৎ বামী প্রজ্ঞানন্দ সরস্বতী
ডাঃ প্রবন্ধনাথ বন্দ্যোপাধ্যায় লিখিত ভূমিকা, সহিত।
পাশ্চাত্য রাজনৈতিক চিন্তার ভূমিকামূলক আলোচনা।
সম্পূর্ণ নূতন।

মূল্য

2 Non-Co-Operation and National
ism:—by Prof. Vaswani, with an introduction
Sj. Syam Sunder Chakraverty, Editor "The"
A collection of some of the best writings of Prof. V
on the present topic
Price 6 annas

3 অর্থ—বরাদ্দ মঞ্জীত।

এই পুস্তকে প্রদত্তে রূপীপ্রনাথের যে আলোচনা আছে,
চিত্রে নব্বু বলের সকার চইবে—কর্তব্যে দৃঢ়তা ও সাহস বৃদ্ধি
এই পুস্তকে প্রসিদ্ধ প্রসিদ্ধ বন্দ্যোপাধ্যায়ের সংগৃহীত চইরাছে।

Printed by K. C. BOSF
at the STANDARD DRUG PRESS
45 Amherst Street, Calcutta

Published by
SAPASWATI LITARI,
9 Kora Nath Mission Street.

PREFACE.

"Back to ourselves" is non-co-operation. To tend to truth is non-co operation. To leap to life is non-co-operation. To do what the heart dictates and conscience commands is non-co-opration. We feel that we have sunk very low even in our own estimation. We have no resources, no credit, nothing to fall back upon. Materially we are worse than bankrupt. Are we then to give up the struggle or go to the very root of Matter? Man makes the last great effort; he carries his appeal to the slumbering spirit when he sees that nothing visible, nothing tangible can come to his rescue. We have men, but we cannot call them our own. We still produce wealth, but do not know where it goes. We have brains, but they produce nothing which benefits us as a people. We have money only to be invested in gilt-edged securities or in concerns run by others; and what has impoverished us most is this mutual distrust among ourselves. The taint of indigeneity vitiates every enterprise in our eyes; hence we keep it at arm's length. Enthusiasm forthwith evaporates at the very mention of national activity. 'Prune thou thy words, thy thoughts confine'—this is the behest with which our aspirations are greeted. And need we

complain of it? Long used as mere pawns in a game played by others, we are no better than the dolls described in Pundit Vidyasagar's primers. We have eyes but see not, ears but hear not, a nose but smell not, and so on. Every nerve gets atrophied by disuse and no wonder that this great Leviathan of a nation has ceased almost to function through long lack of feeling and willing. If this nation has still any signs of life left, if there is any indication, however feeble, that it can be medicated back into a strong and healthily being, is there a man with a spark of patriotism in him who can mistake the direction the treatment should take? Lie, unreality, mimicry, simulation, hypocrisy have killed us. The land that in the very twilight of civilisation radiated the light of truth throughout the world, whose primeval forests rang with the message of truth, is now penetrated by untruth, stratum after stratum. Our earth and water still yield their riches, but not to our efforts nor to our benefit. Our brains still work, our muscles still energize, our arms still exert, but not at our corporate will. Is not then this recovery of will, the one thing needful? We cannot feed ourselves, we cannot clothe ourselves, we cannot protect ourselves. Our jute, our rice, our wheat, our coal, our transports, our communications are all there but they are not fully or readily available for our use. We are not masters in our own house. Should we not then

strive after this mastery? If we make this attempt if we obey this law of life, if we try hard to command the very secret of existence, if we refuse to bow to environment how do we offend against truth, justice love and good faith? Is this evolution or revolution? The war has been fought, we have just been told by a people-prescribed paper, "to assert the principle that to every human being, and every organised aggregation of human beings there attaches the indefeasible right to regulate his, or its existence according to his or its own will and not the will of another' Do we then commit a crime by seeking to recognise this principle by our combined efforts to be regulated by our own will and not by the will of others? Has not the war restored to us also this indefeasible and inalienable right? In spite of the war, this right is seen to belong only to those who can enforce it. Circumstanced as we are, how can we claim this right except by striving to awaken that soul which is feigning Yoga nidra a seeming withdrawal from outward activities and diving into its self? This is what our fathers have done when ever the protective arm of their Divine Mother seemed to have denied them its refuge. It is by moving back to self, diving deep into self, that they propitiated the self and called forth its latent energy into play.

Some would say, this is sheer madness. As Idealism always seems to be madness to the sober (?) and calculating, this Non co operation—this National

Idealism of ours, must also appear to be so to them. But, with all its madness, this National Idealism is the only redeeming feature; it *shall*, after all, save our Nationality.

Now as regards the writer, Prof. Vaswani requires no introduction to the public. In the Swadeshi days, he was here as Professor and a co-worker of Upadhyaya Bramha Bardhab. At that time he earned the best opinion of his pupils, both as a professor and as a man. I am sure these contributions of his, for the upkeep of the Nationality, will not fail to make their impression on the public mind.

THE 'SERVANT' OFFICE }
 17th. January 1921 } SWAM SUNDEL CHAKRAVERTY

3

Freedom's Flag they bore and lifted high,—
 Socrates and Jesus and St. Joan of Arc,
 And Mahomed the Praised, and Mazzini, Mansur,
 And many more—God's Rebels—in East and West,
 With bleeding hearts they bore it on the world's rough road
 Silent in the midst of lies,
 Calm in the midst of tumult, strong under every strain,
 And worshipping the Beautiful in bitter struggle and pain.

4

"Tis the Banner of the Immortals !
 It calls us through the din and the dark of to-day ;
 It calls us to prove our manhood in the strength of the
 Pure and the Meek !
 It calls us to a new consecration,
 To make life an Oblation,
 To seek not Greatness but the Service of the Nation,
 To adore Allah the Merciful 'midst struggle and strife :
 So may the Peoples enter into Freedom and Life.

HAYAT-I-AZAD.

The National Congress has blessed Non-co-operation! The Collective Wisdom of the Nation stands on the side of Non-co-operation! It is the greatest decision of the Congress. It indicates, I believe, the dawn of a New Day in our History.

For this Non-co-operation is a positive, practical method of building up a Life of Freedom (Hayat-i-Azad). By adopting it, the Nation declares to the world its faith in itself and in the Might of Right. The old belief in petitions and prayers to the bureaucracy is shattered! In a famous passage,

LORD MORLEY

says the lesson of Burke's impeachment of Warren Hastings taught with sufficiently impressive force the great lesson that "Asiatics have rights and Europeans have obligations." The Hunter Report, the Dyer Debate and the dismemberment of Turkey, have shown that the present Government believes neither that 'Asiatics have rights,' nor that it has 'obligations.' The Rowlatt Act, the Martial Law *regime*, the British Cabinet's decisions on the Hunter Report, and the fate of the Khilafat Delegation in England, are instances of the failure of the current methods of agitation. The

Montagu Act does not mend matters in any essential point; the Administration continues to be *bureaucratic, irresponsible*. The Nation's

AWAKENED SELF-RESPECT

can no longer submit to methods of political mendacity the only method open to India is Non-Co-operation, and the National Congress has given in its blessings.

There is a class schooled in diplomacy and prudence, it will continue to oppose non-co-operation. But Young India understands that truth is above diplomacy and self-respect above prudence, and Young India will not co-operate with evil, with unrighteousness, with a Government which has trampled upon Truth and Humanity. Non-Co-operation is *not* unconstitutional, but

IF ONE HAD TO CHOOSE

between the *constitutional-immoral* and the *unconstitutional-moral*, is there an honest man who would hesitate in his choice? Some of the world's great ones have been non-co-operators. 'Conformity,' Emerson rightly says, 'is the hobgoblin of little minds.' Socrates was a non-conformist a non-co operator and the Athenian State damned his conduct as unconstitutional. Some of the Jewish Prophets non co operated, denouncing their Governments in strong terms. Jesus, Prince of Peace, suffered but refused to co operate with the authorities at Jerusalem

Nor must the lesson of some recent events be lost upon us. Labour's 'Council of Actions' resolved to 'down tools' and prevented Lloyd George's Government from going upon a war with Soviet Russia over Poland. Egypt has attained to some measure of 'independence' by non-co-operating with the Milner Mission; the people stood united in their support of the nationalist leader, Zaghlul Pasha and when the Milner Mission asked a poor farmer if he was not happy under the British, he refused to enter into a talk with them, his one answer being :—"Go and meet our Leader, Zaghlul Pasha". Last year when the Chinese were excited over the Shantung question, the

NON CO OPERATION OF CHINESE STUDENTS

was enough to embarrass the authorities. About 3 million Chinese students went on a political strike against the Peking Cabinet who were playing into the hands of Japan. "We are leaving our studies," they said in a long telegram to the Peking Government, "as a protest. We, the growing generation of China, we shall have the burden of winning back the rights for China throughout our lives. When we strike to-day it is the beginning of our effort to win back in fair fight what the treacherous of our land have sold for a mess of pottage.....We hope that the merchants, shopkeepers and labourers will join us in our movement." The Chinese Students thus started a movement of "To the people," a Non-Co-operation Movement. At first they were sneered at by the Cabinet as 'five minute

enthusiasts, they demanded resignation of the Cabinet whom they denounced for surrendering Chinese interests to the ambitions of Japan, they demanded, too, that the Government should refuse to sign the peace Treaty nor recognise the Shantung 'settlement', they were denounced by the Government, over 1,000 of them were arrested, they induced merchants and labourers also to non co operate, the Movement spread, on an appointed day, every shop was closed, the market men refused to bring in their supplies, labourers and printers joined in this Chinese *hartal*, the Chinese Coolies refused to handle Japanese cargoes, even the ships' crews joined the Movement, the soldiers gave them their sympathy and moral support, the Cabinet fell, one by one the leaders of the anti National party in the Government resigned their posts, the Government gave way to the demands of the Student Movement, and Japan is unable to crush the boycott of 400 millions in China. Ireland is another case of what a people can achieve in the lines of non co operation. The Irish have refused to co operate with the Administration and have established

SINN I PIN COULTS

Writing on this subject to the *Weekly News* of Cork, Lord Monteagle says,—"The Sinn-I-pin 'Courts' are steadily extending their jurisdiction and dispensing justice even handed between man and man Catholic and Protestants, farmer and shopkeeper, grazeer and

cattle-driver, landlord and tenant" Again, the Irish refusing to serve in the

POLICE AND MILITARY

departments of the Government are doing splendid service to the Sinn Fein organisation Lord Monteaigle admits that "the Sinn-Fein police are arresting burglars, punishing cattle drivers, patrolling the streets, controlling the drink traffic apparently in some cases with the acquiescence of the local military authorities, who thus show themselves wiser than either the castle officials or the British Government."

To speak of 'non co operation' as the 'most foolish of foolish movements' is to misread History and the Spirit of Man. No Government can long continue without the 'co operation' of the people. Sir Horace Plunkett—a Home Ruler, not a Sinn Feiner—rightly points out the powerlessness of *Government with the dissent of the governed*. Again, to speak of non co operation as impracticable is to do injustice to the new national consciousness. Young India does not attach any social honour to titles received from the *sir* Gradual withdrawal from state controlled schools and courts—is that impracticable? Why should India find it impossible to do what Ireland has achieved in a few years? Education is the Art of Life, and when there is a cleavage between the bureaucracy and the People, you must not expect the state-controlled institutions to teach students the true Art of Life. Is it impracticable to withdraw boys from such schools and

train them in National Institutions ? Is it impracticable to build up Panchayat Courts ? Is it impracticable to build up *swadeshi* centres and secure for them the services of those who give up Government's posts ? Non-co-operation *does* mean denial of ease and comfort, but if India is a living nation it can not refuse to place religion and self-respect above ease and comfort. It was

AN ANCIENT LAW-GIVER

of the East who said :—' If a state is not governed by the principle of reason, riches and honours are the subjects of shame. To co-operate with the Government *does* mean riches and titles ; but who that loves his Nation will have them, knowing that such co-operation means practically the support of a policy of repression and of the wrongs inflicted on India and Islam ?

Non-Cooperation is no impracticable scheme of the feeble-minded. Non-co-operation means solidarity of the Muslim and the Hindu for the purpose of securing justice for Islam and safeguarding the life and culture of India and East. That Solidarity is the greatest guarantee of India's Freedom. Not to stand by the Muslim in his struggle for justice would be not alone to fail in our duty but also to let India become a house divided against itself. The Movement of Non-co-operation gives the Nation the long-looked-for opportunity to establish a

HINDU-MUSLIM SOLIDARITY,

without which I see no hope of Self-Government

It introduces spiritual and moral factors into our struggle for Liberty. It brings the great masses on the side of the National Cause

The decision of the Congress is a call to every one to consecrate anew his actions and aspirations to the service of Truth For Non Co operation against a powerful, well organised Government means suffering, means sacrifice, it will mean, in many cases, struggle not simply against official repression—that is bearable—but struggle against the counsels of those dear and near to us as parents, family members and friends Yet true, to day, is

WHAT THE MASTER TAUGHT

two thousand years ago—"He that loveth father or mother more than Me is not worthy of Me" It is a momentous decision the Nation has taken, it is a decision not of expediency or despair but of Faith After a long, painful period of wander years, India's eyes have opened on a Path not strewn with roses yet rich in Promise Will Sind press forward under the leading of the Star of the Nation's Destiny?

INDIAN IDEALS IN CONTEMPORARY LITERATURE.

At a time when Nations of the west are worshipping Mammon and the military machine, it is a relief to find there are groups of earnest men and women who find inspiration in the wisdom of India's Scriptures and India's Sages. "We are all wrong," writes an eminent Frenchman, "about what is happiness and what is good. The most generous souls are all wrong, too, because silence and solitude are too often denied them." As a small but significant book just out, "The Way of Poetry" edited by John Drinkwater, says :—

"In crowded streets flowers never grow
But many there hath died away "

India's sages have been lovers of silence, and they have sung their Scriptures away from 'crowded streets' in the solitudes of forests and streams and hills and mountains. Europe and America have glorified the cults of power and pride and trampled upon the Sermon on the Mount. Europe and America need a New Voice—not of self assertion but of self-denial—the Message of Christ the Master, of Buddha the Illuminated—the Message to deliver which India lives and strives to be free.

The Message has been sung with a poet's vision and a poet's gift of words and with a wonderful sensitiveness

to the great silences of Nature by Rabindra Nath Tagore; and the West has rightly appreciated the 'Gitanjali' as a contribution to world-literature. Indian idealism is influencing Western thought, and some of the great ideas of Indian consciousness are influencing Western literature.

THE GREAT IRISH POET

Yeats has, in several of his Essays and Songs, rung changes on the Hindu idea of *Karma* and Re-incarnation. James Stephens has blessed his little volume of Verses published some time ago, with the title "Re-incarnation;" and Algernon Blackwood and Violet Pearn have in a Play attempted to represent dramatically the ideas of *Karma* and Re-incarnation. The book is frankly named "*Larma A Re-Incarnation play.*" Its hero and heroine live in four different births, in Egypt, Greece, Italy, England. When they live in Egypt, the heroine induces the hero to give up thoughts of priesthood

FOR THE SAKE OF HER LOVE

Reborn in Greece in the days of Alexander the Great, the heroine induces the hero to betray his country for the sake of her love! Born again in Italy in the days of Lorenzo de Medici, the heroine induces the hero to prostitute his art for the sake of her love! Born a fourth time in modern England, the heroine induces the hero to decline a high Government appointment in Egypt for the sake of her love! So

through all these re incarnations it is the *woman* who acts as a dragweight on the man. It is not a pleasant thought for those of us who believe that Woman will be the centre of the coming civilization and her intuitions and mysticism of sympathy will help life more in the coming days than the intellect of man. But the great lesson of life stands out clear in the Play, the lesson that

CHARACTER IS DESTINY

Your *Karma* is what you do, and your deeds become your destiny, nor can you escape this *destiny of deeds* except through a *deed of self surrender* to the beneficent effort of the Universe which, in the language of religion, is called the Grace of God. It is easy for men to say —This evil thing we do today, we shall shake off its influence to morrow. Life tells a different tale, for the Universe moves along the lines of Law.

THE GREAT LAW LIVES

and the evil men or nations do pursue them as a *sword of Justice*. The hero in the Play succumbed to flirtations of the heroine in Egypt first, and in every successive birth was dragged down by the *Karma* he himself had created. Our choice may be brief, but it may prove almost endless. As the hero of the Play *Karma* says :—"The choice is made, not for this life only but for ever." Yet another book in English which I believe is an indication of the growing influence

of Indian thought is Mrs Rhys Davids' Book of the kindred Sayings." Mrs Rhys Davids is an ardent Student of Buddhism and this book gives a beautiful translation of the saying of and about the Buddha. The teacher sits

IN THE FOREST,

yet not cut off from communication with men and women they come to him, from far and near; they come to listen to him, to gaze at the calm beauty of his face and to carry with them some strength for life of action in the world. A mother tells her little boy to be quiet as they approach him—"Hush! make no noise, the Buddha is speaking holy words." And

HIS HOLY WORDS

have but one dominating idea—the peace of Life cometh through self-renunciation. "Save by renouncing" says the Teacher, "no safety can I see for living things." So it is when a Brahmin farmer who has lost fourteen oxen sees him in the forest 'seated in the cross-legged position, and with a wondrous beauty and calm in his face, the former spontaneously says, "It is good to be like unto this man, he loses no oxen and for him there never comes at dawn a man chiding him with debts and saying 'come pay, come pay there fore, a *happy* man is he." Happy

for he—the Buddha—walked

THE WAY OF SELF-RENUNCIATION.

There is a book named "Karma" by that famous interpreter of Japan, Lafcadio Hearu. There is a play on Krishna and the Gopies by the famous Irish poet, James Stephen; these and several other books, of which there is no time to speak to-day, afford proofs of the growing influence of Indian idealism on several groups of earnest men and women in the West. Some of them, indeed, appreciate Indian thought and literature and religions,—the philosophy of the East, the poetry of Iqbal, the mysticism of the *Upanishads*—better than many of us who call ourselves Indians but are strangers to our rich intellectual and spiritual inheritance. This book,—*"The Book of the Kindred Sayings"*—presents in a simple and suggestive way the Message of the Buddha's life. It brings from the past

A MESSAGE WE NEED

to sustain us in the struggles of the Present. It is a Message the modern world needs. For life to-day is full of restlessness, of world-weariness. I recall the words put by a

RUSSIAN NOVELIST

in the mouth of a doctor who feels the dullness of life and who, therefore, *eats enormously whenever he gets a chance*, "Yes!" says the doctor, "if one thinks about it, you know, looks into it and analyses all this hotch-potch, if you will allow me to call it so, it is

not life but more like a fire in a theatre." Modern life, indeed, is full of flaming unrest. The Budha who looked at it directly as a seer saw that the remedy for unrest was self-renunciation. India's sons are restless too,—restless with a righteous impulse of Freedom. But Freedom will not come till we practise *tapasya*. The power of *tapasya* will heal the hurts and maladies of a long-suffering People and India will re-arise to help the Nations.

INDIAN POET-PATRIOT.

Anglo-Indian extremists have said several silly, cruel things concerning Tagore. They could not appreciate an Indian poet who threw up the title of knighthood to be true to India. An Englishman—then the Principal of a College in this country—in a letter to me wondered why Tagore's poetry was being made so much of! When the news came that the Noble Prize was awarded to Tagore, the *Pioneer* was put out and pleaded that Thomas Hardy deserved it better! In Europe, however, the atmosphere in literary circles is not stifled by the political prejudices of Anglo-India; and the receptions accorded to Tagore in London, Sweden, Leyden, Utrecht, Amsterdam indicate cultured Europe's appreciation of the Indian Poet and his Message. An English admirer calls him

A PRINCE OF INDIA

in the largest, greatest sense, 'a seer from the Realm of Ancient Wisdom.' And the message of Tagore to the modern West is essentially the Message of Ancient Wisdom.

In his *Reminiscences*, Tagore mentions with characteristic modesty that he was at one time called the 'Shelley of Bengal'. Some of his English admirers have compared him with Byron. I believe him to

be greater than both,—in insight, in wisdom, in *calm* vision of the Beautiful. The one thing which strikes those who meet him, is his singular modesty. Compared to him, said an English lady, we all appear as savages ! Returning from England with the repute of a world famous poet, he found multitudes waiting for him in Bombay and Calcutta, anxious to do him honour. But this Sage of modern India swiftly left the scenes of honour and glory, he escaped the crowds to find rest in the seclusion of Bolpore, Tagore has been nourished on

WISDOM OF THE EAST

He has said, more than once, that his inspiration has come to him "from the Upanishads and from Bengal's *Vaishnava* poets." This wisdom of the East he is interpreting in his lectures in Europe on "The Meeting of East and West" and "My Ideal of Education."

The two notes of Ancient Wisdom are, Human Solidarity and Supremacy of Spiritual Values. These, Tagore emphasises when showing the weaknesses of Western civilization. Speaking to the English people he says—"When you come in contact with alien peoples, with other races, your want of love of humanity, becomes apparent. Asia has suffered thus; Africa is suffering." Again,—"Think of the ruthlessness and the commercialism present in the modern politics of Europe and America." Europe has trampled upon the vision of the Eternal and the truth of Human Fellowship. As an eminent French novelist

ANATOLE FRANCE

confessed the other day, patriotism has meant "Hatred of the other nations as much as love of your own." "Hatred," Anatole France says, "is growing in Europe instead of democracy", and he makes the significant remark—"It is Europe now that is the 'sick man' of the world. And peace, has not brought its balm." This peace, as I have urged again and again, tramples upon Islam. This Peace assaults the Spirit of Asia. This peace is the seed of new wars. This peace lets loose economic imperialism upon the nations of the East. Islam saved the Soul of Europe in the Dark Ages ; the Wisdom of the East may yet save the Soul of the modern West. Unfortunately, Europe's commercialism and

CULT OF POWER AND PRIDE

are infecting the East, too, with their harsh materialism. And if Spiritual Idealism perish in the East what will help the World ?

Hence the necessity laid upon us to guard the cultures and civilizations of the Orient against the cruel assaults of Europe. If Orient's ancient Nations die, the life of Humanity will suffer, and we are not for National Freedom not as brigands but as servant of Humanity. Tagore says in his *"Reminiscences"*—"My mind refused to respond to the cheap intoxication of the political movements of those days devoid, "

they seemed, of all strength of national consciousness, with their complete ignorance of the country, their supreme indifference to real service of the motherland." Tagore's criticism is, unfortunately, true of some politicals—men who *talk* "politics" with little knowledge of India, little strength of the higher national consciousness, little reverence for Humanity. But Tagore's politics are not of this class, his the politics of

'SPIRITUAL HUMANISM.

Spiritual Humanism does not exclude, it enriches, it deepens national patriotism and Anglo-Indians have been unjust to Tagore in criticising him on the ground that a poet must have nothing to do with politics. Tagore has perceived the truth that our politics are a spiritual Pursuit. It will do good to the Anglo-Indian extremists who have attacked the poet for his frank views on the brutal Amritsar affair to remember that some of the poet's earliest Songs—"sung from the west of India into Burmah wherever Bengali is spoken" (to quote from Yeats' introduction to the *Gitanjali*) are

POEMS OF PATRIOTISM.

One of them, "the Sonar Bangla" (The Golden Bengal) is a wondrous utterance of a vision of the glory and valour and nature-beauty of the Poet's nativeland. And if he will translate into English his Songs to the Motherland the western world will know that in some of his noblest poems is that yearning for India, that patriotism which

some of his critics regard as incompatible with 'poetry' ! I believe that Tagore's Songs to the Motherland sound a new note and are a positive contribution to Literature ; and I cannot agree with an English critic of the Poet who says :—"Perhaps their message would hardly come to us with power, for their feeling and atmosphere are more local and temporary."

The message of many of those Poems is :—India must not lose her own self. When we imitate the Englishman or when we abuse him, when we surrender self-respect to bureaucratic threats or favours, when we confound the politics of hate or passion with patriotism, when we fear to speak the truth in the face of repression, when we hesitate to have faith in our-selves and look to others to lead us out of bondage into liberty—then are we on the way to lose India's soul. The way of Non-Co-operation is the way to co-operate with our higher selves, with India's Soul ; it is the way of self-help, self-reliance, self-discipline, self-sacrifice. And Tagore's Poems of Patriotism sound the note, again and again :—Be your own self, Be loyal to India's Soul.

Above the National is the Universal ; Tagore's Poems and his book on 'Nationalism' (he regards it as his greatest book) show that the Poet has glimpsed. ¶

THE BEAUTY OF THE UNIVERSAL :

How this vision came to him is described by him in moving words thus :—

"It was morning. I was watching the sunrise in Free School Street in Calcutta. A veil was suddenly

drawn and everything I saw became luminous. The whole world was one glorious music, one wonderful rhythm. The houses in the street, the men moving, children playing, all seemed part of one glorious whole—inexpressibly glorious. The vision went on for seven or eight days. Everyone, even those who bored me, seemed to lose their outward barrier of personality, and I was full of gladness; full of love for every tiniest thing . . . That was one of the first things which gave me the inner vision. . . . I have felt ever since that this was my goal—to express the fulness of life, in its beauty and perfection, if only the Veil were withdrawn. Strange enough, the vision vanished when he reached the Himalayas. To quote the poet again —“when I reached the Himalayas I thought I would have a fuller vision of that which I had witnessed of the glory of Nature in the crowded street. But that was my great mistake. Up there the vision all departed. God the great giver Himself, can open out the whole universe to our gaze in the narrow space of a single lane.

And Rabindranath has worshipped the vision again and again ‘in the crowded street.’ A lover of silence and seclusion, he is

A LOVER OF LIFE,

a lover of men, of East and west. In a poem of his earlier days he sings :—

This world is sweet—I do not want to die.

I wish to dwell in the ever-living Life of

Tagore has glimpsed the divine beauty of the life of Man ; he has felt the attraction of what he has so beautifully called 'the play of World-Life.' Therefore, has he gone to many climes in East and West, carrying everywhere the Song of the Eternal has set in his heart voicing everywhere the Message of *Aryadarshana*. Can there be a greater gift from the All-Giver to a struggling Nation than this gift of a Patriot-Poet ?

WILL THE FLOWERS FADE ?

In an hour of India's need he came over four centuries ago. An Angel of Revolution, yet living a life of singular sympathy, of winsome detachment from the world ! Singing rapturous songs while Maradana played upon his instrument ' "I am a servant of the Beloved one" he said, "and long to meet my Lord" And this "servant of the Beloved One" became the Builder of a Nation. For the Life and Teaching of Nanak Dev were the inspiration of a long line of the Gurus, the last of whom built the

KHALSA STATE

with the battle cry 'Wah Gurujika Khalsa' (Glory to the Guru's State !) Therefore, I called Guru Nanak an Angel of Revolution. His life and teaching revolutionised the minds and hearts of millions ; and I would have Young India turn to him to day, if it would think out its ultimate ideals and understand what it should make of the Liberty which can not be long in coming back to this Ancient Land.

A lover of Freedom, he spent his early days in the Freedom of the farm and village life ; and in his days of manhood he travelled far and wide. His blessed feet trod the soil of Sind—my native land ; was the freedom of this desert an attraction for this great

Traveller and Teacher? He went about blessing all to free their minds and hearts of convention and cant. As I have meditated on his words and reviewed the main incidents of his life in the *Janmasakhi*, I have felt more strongly than before, that

A FREE INDIA

could not be built without the power of Faith and Hindu Muslim Solidarity and Service of the Truth. Faith more than the knowledge of books; Hindu Muslim solidarity more than schemes of "reform"; Love of truth more than anything else.

And concerning these three, the Teacher's life has not a little to tell us. Taken to a school master, this great soul, great in humility and love, asks—"Sir, what have you learnt?" And the schoolmaster says, he has learnt all the branches of knowledge, has read the Books, has known 'arithmetic and book-keeping, has known everything'! Then says the Teacher to the schoolmaster—"That kind of learning is useless, Sir." And in a passage of great beauty and wisdom, Nanak sings the very Secret of Education.

Burn wordly thoughts, rub the ashes and make ink of it ;

Let the paper on which you write be the paper of Faith ;

Let your Heart be the Pen ;

Then write the name and the praise there of ;

And write without end or limit.

The current system of education in India has been worse than a failure ; for the wise injunction has been ignored ;—"Let your Heart be the pen ; then write the Name." Intellect has been sharpened ; but when was a Nation saved by a souless intellect ? Brother !

LET YOUR HEART BE THE PEN ;

then write the Name—the Mother's Name—in the ink made of *tapasya* ; and you will write in flaming letters the Freedom of Hindusthan.

And who more than the Teacher bore witness to the essential Brotherhood of the Hindu and the Musalman ? The first words he utters waking up from that trance in the water, are :—"There is no Hindu and no Musalman." He goes to Mecca, he teaches there the Doctrine of the One, he interprets there the Wisdom of the Koran. He utters the name Allah with reverence as he does the name Hari. On meeting him, Sheikh Farid greets him with the words :—"Allah, O Darvish." And to this the Teacher replies ;—"Allah is the object of my efforts, O Farid ; Allah is ever my object." Sheikh Farid, the Muslim Pir, becomes a great friend of Guru Nanak ; and the Sikh Scriptures include many songs of Farid which mention the name of Allah. "There is no case" says the Guru. "We claim brotherhood with all. He alone is the true Mullah, Pir, Sayad or *Dervish* who knows Allah or Hari and has abandoned self". Speaking to the Hindus, he says :—"Praise and glorify, Allah as Muslims do, five times daily." Speaking to the

Muslims, he says — "Make the Will of Allah your rosary" "A real Musliman is he who has renounced self" Is it a wonder the Muslims cried aloud — 'Khuda (God) is speaking to us in Nanak'? Is it a wonder when he passed away, both Hindus and Muslims covered his body with flowers? And the old Chronicle says "All the flowers were green!"

Centuries have passed since the Master left India on the physical plane, and, to-day after a long period of seperation, we—Muslims and Hindus of India—have in the hour of India's urgent need, we have learnt to come together again, and in common reverence to place

OUR FLOWER

at the feet of the India that he loved and upon which, I believe, he pours his benedictions still Will our new flowers remain green? Or will the flowers fade?

You can keep the flowers fresh but on one condition And that is expressed by the Guru in the following words —

'Heaven accepts no more lip service but the continual love and practice of truth'

He loved and practised truth, and we must endeavour to do likewise, if we would keep in our hearts the message of this day To celebrate him is to assimilate him There is social injustice in this land, there are political wrongs inflicted on India and Islam It is good that in this day of our sorrow Hindus and

and Muslims are drawing closer together ; there are Hindu admirers of Islam and Muslim culture, there are Muslim admirers of the philosophy and art of the Hindus.

HINDU-MUSLIM FRIENDSHIP

is growing every day. I thank God for it. But let this friendship be for the love and practice of truth. Let it give us a new strength to fight social injustice a new faith to wrestle with political wrongs. There is the work for you, brother ! Give your life and heart in the service of the Truth. That service, I know, means, struggle and pain. But suffering is, the price of freedom. And I believe, profoundly that

INDIA WILL BE REBUILT

UPON SACRIFICE.

Thus wrought the great Gurus in the past. And thus must we strive to-day, believing that to suffer in the 'love and practice of truth' is only to enrich the Heritage of our History.

THE STUDENT REVOLT.

What is the meaning of the Student Revolt at Aligarh, Lahore and Amritsar? It was expressed in that moving appeal, issued by Aligarh to Indian Students. "India's soul is revolting" it said, "against the humiliation and insults offered to her every day. In the name of all that is best and noblest in the heart of men, we appeal to you to join us in our just and righteous cause and sacrifice time, toil and talent to bring this struggle to a successful issue" And the Appeal closes on a great note :—

"For Freedom's battle once begun,
Though baffled oft is ever won ;"

It is such Resolves which have revolutionised the thoughts and lives of Nations. One recalls what Egyptian students did in the days of Egypt's struggle for freedom. The entire University of El-zahar¹ was emptied, and young men moved out to villages to preach to the peasants the National Gospel of Liberty. So when Hungary resolved to achieve its freedom, its youngmen left the State Universities and joined the new National Universities built by the sacrifice of a few of

HUNGARY'S PATRIOTS

They knew,—the youngmen in Egypt and Hungary, that in adopting the course they did, they must

suffer, but youngmen in whom the life pulse beats warm are not afraid of suffering Garibaldi, setting out to liberate Italy meets some young men standing in a street he asks them to join him "What will you offer"? They ask "Offer?" answered Garibaldi — "I offer you hardship, hunger, rags, thirst, sleepless nights, foot sores in the long marches, privations innumerable and Victory in a Noble Cause" And

YOUNG ITALY

followed him Young men respond to the appeal for sacrifice, while those advanced in age indulge in the nice calculating lore of less and more Profit and loss philosophy never inspired young men in any age "Prudence," said Sri Keshub Chandra Sen of blessed memory, 'is the arithmetic of fools' Young men believe and do while the middle aged men calculate and trample upon the ideal During the martial law regime, the Principals of certain Colleges at Lahore were required to punish at least 10 per cent of their students, and a 'schedule of punishments' was supplied them by the Officer Commanding And the Principals quietly submitted to the inhuman demands of the Officer A thousand times better would it have been to have closed the Colleges in obedience to the Call of the Ideal

The Student Revolt, now spreading to a number of schools and Colleges will not be appreciated by many of the "elders" who have, for long years, moved

in an atmosphere of acquiescence. But the hearts of the young respond to the ideal; and it is the efforts of the Young that will build India of Tomorrow. Young men, all over the country are beginning to realise that the current system of education *does not build character*. The reason is not far to seek. The Schools and Colleges are more or less State Departments; they are, more or less official 'controlled and where the hand of the official sits heavy, the students cannot move in an

ATMOSPHERE OF FREEDOM.

"Rule Britannia, Britannia rules the Waves" Such Imperialistic ideas are taught to our boys in the schools. In his booklet "Indian Reform, the Imperial Idea and Provincial Progress", Sir Harcourt Butler urges that *faith in the Empire* will be the salvation of Indian education. The deeper meanings of Indian thought and life and history are not taught our boys; differences of creed and race in India are exaggerated by the text-book writers with a view to argue that the Empire alone can give India the Unity she needs. A National policy in economics, our students are told, would do harm to India. For "British trade has done marvels for India". The Life plants in every Nation is not of the earth, earthly; it is an outbreathing of the Eternal. Yet that Life—the National Life—is snubbed in a variety of ways by the current system of education.

A University should be a centre of thought which remains passionately free

THE POLITICAL CIRCULARS

issued from time to time by Provincial Governments,—circulars which seek to create an artificial separation between education and National life—have aimed at stifling freedom of thought. The Official hand sits heavy on Indian Universities. And the Student Revolt is an assurance that faith in freedom yet endures, it lives in the hearts of the Young, it is destined to grow, and you can no more crush it than you can, Life itself

The National Muslim University grows out of a great struggle for Freedom. And the appeal of Aligarh Students will go down to history as a document filled with young men's love for freedom and for that which makes freedom worth living for, dying for viz the spiritual ideal. For in this struggle is the spirit not alone of the Nation but also of Islam eager to maintain its character as an

INTERNATIONAL BROTHERHOOD

Reflected in Muslim Literature is a noble Human Vision which Islam evolved out of the depths of its own life in the days of its greatness. That Literature enshrines some of the noblest dreams man has dreamt, it enshrines some of man's most precious reminiscences of the Eternal, and this memory must be awakened in the hearts of the rising generation

of Indian Muslims if they are to help the Nation in the days before them. The Muslim's aspiration, his glimpses into the Great Secret, his Meditations on the World-Mystery recorded in his Literature and Philosophy and Art really belong to all time ; they are the old that ages not, the old that has a message for the new ; they utter a Vision of the Eternal which the sad world needs. Of this Islamic Culture, may the new Muslim University become a living *Shrine*, and if the Hindu and Sikh communities follow the example of their Muslim brethren and build up National Universities, they will have provided their students with an education which will contribute to their

SELF-REALISATION FOR THE SERVICE OF FREEDOM

Such Universities indeed will enter into the heritage of Hindusthan. They will give a new vigour to the Nation's mind. They will play the part they alone can in the work of National Emancipations. For such Universities will become the home of intellectual and spiritual freedom. And their Graduates will go out into the great University of Life not merely as scholars but also as torch-bearers of a Culture alive with Faith in the values of Religion and in India's high Destiny.

STUDENTS AND THE STRUGGLE FOR FREEDOM.

Friends : It is your *karma* to live at a great hour in India's destiny. For let us confess it, this Movement of Non-Co-operation is revolutionary in its character. It is pledged to a creed of non-violence : but it does mean to revolutionise the minds and hearts of the people. It is your *karma* to live at the birth-hour of such a movement. That *karma* may be your *privilege* if you resolve to help the Nation at this hour. And the thought I would have you take with you to-night is, that you, student and youngmen, can do much. I know the teaching, given you in the Government controlled institutions, is not responsive to the National Ideal. Your schools and colleges, as they are to-day, are

PRISON-HOUSES.

When they should be *open windows* letting in the light of the great Life of the Nation. Your education is not related to the *life of India*. Do your College text-books tell you of Tagore in literature, of Shah Latif in lyric poetry, of Sir J. C. Bose in science, of Hindu-darshanas in philosophy, of Tilak or

Gandhi in politics? Surveying the Indian situation several years ago, Lok. Tilk said :—"The remedy is not petition but boycott." Of boycott, as a political method you read little in your text-books which tell either of 'constitutional' agitation or violence. Again Mahatma Gandhi's *satyagraha* is a method not known to your text-books in political science. They tell you that the basis of society is *force*, the great Indian leader tells you that society lives by *satya*, the *power of the soul*, the.

WILL-TO SUFFER.

For that to me is the essential meaning and message of *satyagraha* and non-co-operation. Europe's nationalisms, its very internationals, are expressions of Europe's will-to-power. Europe's League of Nations is really a League of Imperialisms, and cannot give the world that peace which the Nations will not find until they become Servants of Humanity. Of these and other things congenial to the Indian mind little is told you in your text-books. Therefore I say your schools are prison-houses. they shut you out of the thought and life of India. In American institutions they teach sciences, humanities and Americanism, in India they teach you several subjects but not the one subject needful—India :

Yet I would not have you take with you any depressing thought, I wish you to have the inspiring thought that you can do much for the Nation. The motive of my talk with you is to awaken in you.

if I can, 'faith' in your powers to make a mighty Nation. History shows how much young men and

STUDENT-MOVEMENTS

have done for the Nations. Think of Athens. Socrates was not alone a thinker; he was a Patriot, and he wished to help the life of Greece by inspiring young men with the ideals of Truth and Beauty and Justice. "A corrupter of youth" they called this Teacher of ancient Greece; he did not mind what his enemies said or did to discredit him; he went about doing good. One of his pupils was Plato; and Aristotle was Plato's pupil, and in the hearts of these two young men—as readers of the "Republic" and the "Politics" know—in the hearts of these two Greeks, who owed much to the inspiration of the Socratic Teaching—in their hearts was the vision of a strong moral State, which Greece could only partially assimilate. Think of Italy. There was a time as some of you may know, when Italy was under the heels of Austria.

MAZZINI

§ .
arose with a dream of Italian emancipation in his heart; and Mazzini spread his message through students and young men; he formed, you know, the "Order of Young Italy." Think of the Germany of pre-War days. In the days of Metternich, Germany was in a sorry state. But it was the German students who dreamt the dream of a great Fatherland. Some

of them grew to be the great proclaimers of Liberty in Germany. One of them was Marx, the Father of the Modern Revolution against capitalism. Other students who dreamt of liberty and who, in the days of their manhood, served Germany in several fields, were Engel, Heine, and Lassgle. Think of Egypt The

NATIONAL UNIVERSITY

of Elzeher is, I believe, one of the greatest of the world's universities; over ten thousand students reside there, every year, and are trained for nation-service; how much they have helped Egypt by organising meetings and processions, and spreading the message of Freedom in villages is known to every student of Egyptian nationalism. Japan, owes much to her students; one of them:

TOGO,

longed to do things for her; he went to Europe to study Western science; he returned to Japan to serve her and make her great among the nations; he inflicted a heavy defeat on the Russians in the Russo-Japanese war; he broke the "hypnotism of color." He proved how wrong were the Western thinkers who conveniently believed with Hegel that Asia was doomed to be dominated by Europe.

One of the latest illustrations of what students can do is supplied by recent happenings in China. British diplomacy, as some of you may know, favoured

Japan at the expense of China. Shantung was snatched from China and given over to Japan. There was an agitation in Peking. The Chinese officials were influenced, it was hoped the agitation would die out. But no 'influence' or intimidation could extinguish the patriotic fire in the hearts of some

CHINESE STUDENTS

They resolved that the Chinese officials who had sold their country for gold should go. They resolved that China must not sign the Peace treaty, they resolved that until justice was done to China, Japanese goods must be boycotted. They were asked by their school masters not to meddle with matters 'political', they were denied sympathy by the rich and powerful. Some of them were fired upon by the police, some of them were arrested and imprisoned. They were not cowed down, persecution gave a new life to the student movement. The students won the sympathy of shopkeepers, they organised *kartals* they organised big Conferences, students, boys and girls, carried on a vigorous campaign of boycott against Japanese goods. What, you will ask me, have they achieved? More than there is time to tell. They compelled the Cabinet to resign, and China did not sign the Peace treaty. They influenced the merchants and Japanese goods were boycotted. They organised National Education Conferences. They have spread the message of

Marx and Plato to thousands of villages; they have started several students' journals. They have opened several centres of social service. They have created a new intellectual revolution among the masses; and their movement—the Student Movement—is secure to-day against all repression and can not be crushed.

I have spoken to you of the students and young men of different countries that you may know that you too and others such as you, the students of India, can do much for India at this hour of India's need. And in order that you may serve her in the coming days, I ask you to be in touch with the shopkeepers, the peasants, the masses. My charge against the current system of education is—it isolates you;

IT SEPARATES YOU

from them; it does not bind you with them in a common life. Then Bharata needs in the coming days; and I ask you to realise your unity with them to give them modern knowledge, to learn of them the wisdom of life enshrined in the old books recited by them but unknown to you. Some of you, I am glad, take interest in the local Night School. We need many Night Schools but we need them to *obliterate* not *emphasise* conventional distinctions; we need them as *bonds of unity* not as *walls of separation* between one class and another. They have in Paris what is called the *Ecole Socialiste*, Social School; and one beautiful thing about it is that labourers and College students sit together there,

and to bring them together, eminent lecturers like Bergson, are invited to give evening addresses at the School. I want you, students to sit together with the poor Labourers in your Night School; sit with them in your reading room and library, talk to them and mix with them and make them feel you are their friends. They need you, you need them, in the Service of the Nation.

I want you, young men, to visit villages in parties during your vacations. I want you to meet peasants and labourers and.

SPEAK TO THEM OF SWARAJ

and of the modern prophets of freedom. I want you to create an intellectual and national awakening in every village. But we are so few, you say, don't think of it, I say, only have faith in your powers; and you will work wonders. In a recent English poem named the "Hounds of Hell" the poet Masfield gives the story of a country haunted by hounds. A saint goes to face the hounds; he turns back dismayed. He makes a second effort to master the hounds which attack his country. He crosses a stream; he passes into a new world, the heaven world; there he hears the birds talking to the other. He is given the power to understand the language of the birds, he finds they tell of the

DELUSION OF MEN.

That delusion according, to the birds is this:—Men never guess that deep within them stand courage and wis-

dom and loveliness. My young friends, I have little more to say to you. My message to you to-night, is the.

MESSAGE OF THE BIRDS

in the story. Have faith in yourselves. Break the delusion that students can do little for the nation. Rise above the *maya* which has made you weak. Believe in your powers and your opportunities. Remember that deep within you stand courage and wisdom and loveliness. Servants of the National Cause ask for your help at this hour of the mother's needs. Only have faith in yourselves. Only set free the divine within you. And you will be among those who are to achieve the salvation of Hindustan.

EGYPTIAN NATIONALISM

Messrs Macmillan have just published a book named "The Egyptian Problem" Its author is Sir Valentine Chirol His earlier book on "Unrest in India" is notorious for its attack on Lokmanya Tilak and its attitude to Indian Nationalism Sir Valentine Chirol has learnt a little, but only a little since he wrote that book His "Egyptian Problem" is unfair at once to the modern spirit of Nationalism "Self determination" he coolly says, "may be an admirable principle but only unreasoning faith can urge that it is of universal application or that it should be applied to people incapable of expressing themselves as the Egyptian masses still are" I recall what an European at Cairo said of Egyptians "they were the most insipid and the emptiest chatterboxes in the world" "What they love," he added, is talking without saying anything" The European is, oftener than not, contemptuous in his

ATTITUDE TO THE ORIENTAL

The Indian, we have been often told, is unfit for *paraj* And the English do us a favour to consent to be with us as our 'trustees'. As early as 1893, Lord Rosbery said, (he was then the Foreign Secretary) —"This, at least, may be laid down with absolute certainty that Egypt would, in no case, be released from European control which might possibly be asserted

in a much more stringent and irksome form than at present." Egyptian Nationalism has challenged 'European control', has broken its spell, has shown that a living people cannot be long dominated by a foreign power.

Sir Valentine blames Egyptian bankruptcy for British Occupation! He even argues that the British occupation was 'in the interests of the Egyptian masses'! Sir Valentine Chirol murders history to save British prestige and professions!

DISRAELI,

the Prime Minister of England in 1875, induced the British Government to purchase a large number of shares in the Suez Canal held by the extravagant Khedive, Ismail Pasha. Mr. Gladstone denounced the purchase as immoral. Disraeli did not scruple to 'confiscate Egypt'! He defended the purchase as 'a political transaction' calculated to strengthen the Empire and to secure a 'highway to our Indian Empire and our other dependencies'. England and France conveniently joined hands to control Egypt! The Dual control was soon followed by the British military occupation of Egypt! The Khedive became a nominal ruler; the provincial, internal and foreign relations of Egypt were controlled by the British! When did Imperialism listen to the still, small voice of conscience? When Sir Charles Napier was leading his army against Sind, he said with a soldier's frankness:—"We have no right to seize Sind, yet we shall

do so ; and a very advantageous, useful and humane piece of rascality it will be " ! And after the battle of Miam, he telegraphed to Lord Ellenborough—*Peccavi*—I have sinned (Sind) ! Imperialism carries on its back

THE BURDEN OF MANY SINS.

Therefore is its wages—death ! The story of the British occupation of Egypt is a story of capitalism and imperialism. Sir Valentine Chirol defends them 'in the interests of the Egyptian masses.' History will condemn them as enemies of the Spirit of Man.

Sir Valentine says several harsh things of Egyptian Nationalists. He cannot appreciate the beauty of the lives of some of the great builders of New Egypt.

MUSTAPHA PASHA KAMAL

was one of them. An ardent nationalist, he taught the classes to work for Egyptian freedom. "The English", he often said, "must go." A fine scholar and a rich man, he spent his great talents and resources in the service of the National Cause. He could not bear to see the British treat the people of Egypt with arrogance and contempt. "We are constantly being made to feel," he said, "that we are an inferior race." In his French book, named *Egyptiens et Anglaises* published in Paris in 1906, he said—England has only laid hands on the Government of Egypt in order the better to stifle the national sentiment and remove the Egyptians from every source of science and liberty." Again—"The conduct of the English towards

us is unworthy and revolting All our men of worth are driven from power.' "How many times ' he asked, "have we not seen these civilizers commit crimes in broad daylight? Two years ago the English authority at Cairo caused 7 persons to be burnt alive at Baliana, in upper Egypt, on the pretext that they were robbers and resisted the police! A great patriot, he spent his wealth in the service of the national cause, he organised

A PARTY OF INDEPENDENCE

he spoke to students and youngmen, he awakened the peasants, he started a paper called the *Lewa* the word means 'Standard' and held high the standard of Freedom And all this he achieved in a few years He began his work in 1895, he died in Feb 1908 at the early age of 34, and thousands followed the Patriot to the grave

Mahomed Bey Farid was another ardent Nationalist Yet another was Sheikh Shawish, editor of the *Lewa* Referring to the British control of Egypt he wrote —"This land is putrified with their (English) atrocities They tied our tongues, hanged our innocent relatives and perpetrated other horrors sufficient to make Heaven tremble, the earth to split and the mountains to fall down There is a reference here, among other things, to the tragic Denshawai affair Some British Officers went out shooting village pigeons, the peasants were threshing corn, a thresh burst into flames just after the officers had

shot, the peasants made a rush for the shooting party, one of the officers fired at an Egyptian woman, yet another ran to the camp to bring more men against the peasants, he ran under the hot sun, he died of apoplexy. This death was called a murder! The British accused Egyptian peasants of being the authors of the 'murder' and sentenced 4 of them to be hanged and 6 more to be flogged and sentenced to penal servitude! Nationalism

THRIVES ON PERSECUTION

as autocracy does on the people's violence

The more the Egyptian was persecuted the more patriotic he became. 'It would be far better than the present state of things if you did go,' said a wealthy Syrian to an Englishman in Egypt. The spirit of freedom could not be crushed by 'efficiency.' 'A patriot' said an Egyptian, 'would prefer to see his country covered with corpses rather than full of slaves.' The National Party advocated complete independence. Their leader was the man whose name is a household word to-day—

ZAGHLUL PASHA

Sir Valentine Chirol writes with scant sympathy concerning this eminent Nationalist. It is a thrilling story—this of the life and work of Zaghlul Pasha. He believed first in helping his country through the Administration. As Minister of Education he ordered that University lectures be given in Arabic, not in English even by Oxford and Cambridge

men; Arabic became the medium of instruction in all subjects, philosophic, scientific, mathematical, literary. He worked for sometime as Minister of Justice. And as soon as the Armistice was signed in 1918, he demanded evacuation of Egypt by the British; he urged that the British 'Protectorate' must end. He was arrested and deported to Malta. Egypt was aflame with indignation. Zaghlul Pasha was released and sent to France; Zaghlul Pasha became the uncrowned King of Egypt; and under his leadership the people entered upon

A POLICY OF NON-CO OPERATION.

They boycotted the Government; clerks threw up their posts; students gave up their studies; no Egyptian would consent to serve in the Ministry. Rusdhi Pasha was a 'moderate' but even he had been disgusted with the Government, had thrown up his high post and declared his sympathy with the Nationalists. The people obeyed Zaghlul Pasha who issued orders from Paris. The British Government sent a mission under Lord Milner. The people resolved to boycott the Milner mission, Egyptians refused to receive Lord Milner. A peasant in Egypt was asked by Lord Milner what crops he was growing. "Go to Paris, and ask Zaghlul Pasha," said the peasant. Egyptians were out for non-co-operation. Sir Valentine Chirol regards this as a proof of their 'political immaturity'; it is a proof, rather, of their

POLITICAL SAGACITY.

Equally wrong is Sir Valentine in accusing the people of showing a lack of 'social duty'. The Egyptians, even those who were ostensibly with the Government, were at heart with the Nationalist. Zaghlul Pasha was to visit a place in Egypt on his political mission; he asked a gentleman there if he could stay with him; the Egyptian was afraid to have the great Nationalist as his guest; he wrote a letter requesting to be excused, but he put some notes in the letter saying they were his contribution to the Nationalist Fund!

SOCIAL DUTY

the Egyptian Nationalists have shown, in their struggle of Non-Co-operation.

They have not yet attained to 'independence'; what the *Times* calls by that name is only a *compromise* between Zaghlul Pasha and the Government; but the success they have so far scored is due to their *solidarity* built by their strong sense of *social duty*.

Students have played a conspicuous part in the in the struggle. They left Government schools and colleges. El Azhar University is a centre of nationalist propaganda.

THE LAWYERS,

Too, played an important part in the development of Nationalism. The trial of Wardani was an event

in the nationalist politics of Egypt.. Wardani was charged with a political murder, and this is what his Counsel said in the open Court, speaking directly to Wardani :—

"If your great soul refuses to live enchained, arise, go to your death with a brave heart and a firm step. Go, my child, go to your God who holds the scales of sublime equity. Go, our hearts go with you. Go, your death sentence pronounced by human justice may prove more than your life,—a great lesson to your people and your country."

Egyptian pleaders and students, boys and girls, are ardent nationalists. Women too, have taken part in the national movement. Sir Valentine Chirol's book takes notice of the new national consciousness of Egyptian women. So insistent was the call of Nationalism that

THEY LEFT THE VEIL.

and addressed crowds in the streets and at public meetings. No longer could the critics say, as Lord Cromer had said, that the demand of Self-Government in Egypt was spurious and manufactured. A new love for Egypt, a new understanding of the greatness of Egypt as she was in the days when the Greeks were barbarians and Romans uncivilized and Europe plunged in darkness and Egypt was nourished by the wisdom of sages and lawgivers ; a new patriotism has been born in the hearts of her Women. And I have thought, again and again, that in our struggle

of Non-Co-operation we need urgently the support of our women. Women helped much the swadeshi movement during the anti-Partition agitation in Bengal; woman's help is what is needed at this time when we are out to meet the challenge of Government by a simple yet effective method of self-help and soul-force. It is a wise remark Castiglione makes in his famous book - "The Courtier", when he says, - "Man has for his portion physical strength"; all inspiration must come from woman, she is the motive force." Therefore I ask that

A WOMEN'S LEAGUE

be formed, and the Message of Non Co operation carried to women in every town and village. They will plead for national honour, for *szaraj*, for freedom and faith when several professional politicians will be tempted to succumb to thoughts of selfish honour and gain. Thrilled with patriotism the Women of India will bear in their hands the Banner of National Freedom; and what power will withstand them?

"GARDEN OF ANGUISH."

Non-co-operation, like the Kingdom of which Christ spoke, is "as a seed growing." It has not ended in a fiasco, it has not died of 'inanition'. It is 'as a seed growing'—growing every day. And they who scoffed are become serious. "We cannot force ourselves to pretend", writes an English paper, "that all is well, when we have good reason to fear it is not. If public memory were not short, it would recall the anxious time we had in India during the boycott days, a dozen years ago." And the Government of India has been compelled to issue a Resolution condemning non-co operation!

Not a new thing in the world—the policy of non-co operation. Hungary, Ireland, Egypt, Korea have adopted it in their

STRUGGLES FOR FREEDOM.

And it accords with the Indian ideal. Brutes use physical force, India must not use it, and India has lost faith in the 'moderate' method of petitions and paper-resolutions. India has adopted non-violent non-co-operation. But the Government of India's resolution condemns it as 'unconstitutional'. Muslims and Hindus feel they cannot conscientiously co-operate with an unrepentant bureaucracy, with a Government guilty of the Khilafat wrong and the

Punjab tragedy. If refusing co-operation in obedience to a moral call be unconstitutional, then must we place the *moral* above the *constitutional* and

TAKE THE CONSEQUENCES

The one thing the Resolution omits to mention is that the Government of India itself is practising non co operation with the people,—has practised it all these years in repudiating Indian opinion and passing,—Indian protests notwithstanding—measures of repression. In his book on "Decisive Battles in India" Malleon refers to the Indian's "*trusting nature and failure to combine*" as responsible, among other things for their condition

GARDEN OF ANGUISH

The Jallianwalla Massacre, followed by the shameless debate in the Lords, shook India's 'trust' in British professions. So did the partition of Turkey in violation of the Premier's pledge to Indian Muslims. The Khilafat wrong and the Punjab tragedy not only gave a rude shock to our 'trust' in the Administration, they also roused the desire to combine,—a desire which has developed into Hindu—Muslim solidarity. An American writer observed the other day that "any other than a Dyer" would "hide himself by fleeing from the country", but Europeans in India have hailed Dyer as a 'hero' a 'saviour of the Empire', and the Parliament has condoned his conduct! The Indians fought bravely

on the battle plains of Flanders and France, on the perilous heights of Gallipoli, in Egypt and in Africa but when, after the War, they asked for their *rights* they received the Rowlatt Act and, later, the martial law ! No wonder, faith in the British has crumbled and out of the deep agony of a Nation long in quest of Freedom has been born the Gospel of Non-Co-operation

In the Resolution, however, there is not a word of repentance for the wrongs inflicted on the people, not a word to indicate that the Government is ready to do justice to Indian demands

PRESTIGE IS THE GOD

the Government worships And it does lip-homage to 'liberty of speech and freedom of press' Look Sind word, ye who still talk of 'liberty of speech and freedom of press,' and consider the cases of those who have had to suffer for their faith in the Khilafat Ask Sind journals what 'freedom of press' is permitted them in the new era which the Reforms, we are told, have initiated ! Look Punjab ward consider the L. G's order concerning Proclaimed Areas, consider the severe sentence passed upon Moula Zafar Ali Khan Who will believe that Government is 'reluctant' to interfere with 'liberty of speech and freedom of press' ?

THE RESOLUTION

credits India with 'common sense' with good sense with 'sanity' ! And the "confidence of Government

in the good sense of India,' we are told, "has been already in a great measure, justified by the unanimity of her best minds in the condemnation of the Movement." Strange enough, the *Pioneer* which is supposed to know the Government's mind, wrote while condemning sometime ago, the movement of non-co operation, the following significant words — "There can be no doubt that Mr. Gandhi has obtained a great hold upon the imagination of his politically minded fellow countrymen." It is difficult to think the best minds of India are all outside the class of the 'politically minded.' The English educated throughout the country have answered the Government by condemning repression, and many of the English educated support the policy of non-co operation. The Government relies, also on the 'common sense' of the masses' to reject non co operation as a visionary and chimerical scheme. But the Meetings and Conferences attended by thousands of the masses should be an eye-opener to Government, they have shown, again and again, with what enthusiasm the 'masses' respond to the call of non co-operation, not for them have vanished the sanctions of religion, and in their hearts is the passionate desire to,

GUARD INDIA'S HAT

the honour of the Nation. So it is that parchayats and shop keepers and peasants and tradesmen's guilds have, in many places, resolved

to boycott the Councils. One of the *discoveries* of these days is how greatly the masses love India !

Instead, however, of inviting a Conference of Indian Leaders with a view to meet the people's demands in regard to the Khilafat, the Punjab and Swaraj, the Government appeal to 'moderate' men to kill the movement, — 'to organise and take concerted measures and denounce the 'evils of Non Co operation' A 'loyal' paper endorsing the appeal of Government asks the 'moderate leaders to show the way' and urges that Non Co operators "should be shunned like the plague and made to feel that they are social outcasts" The 'moderates' cannot kill the movement

What can kill Non Co operation will be violence on the part of the people Hungarian nationalists made the mistake of assassinations and soon after, of Military aggression, they were defeated by the Austrian Government Their defeat left Austria supreme, their defeat made Austria more autocratic, and all the national institutions were suppressed For a time, indeed it seemed as though Hungary would not re-arise as a nation, Europe deemed Hungary dead, and Francis Deak, the eminent Hungarian patriot, had to put forth tremendous efforts to revive the movement of Non Co operation and sustain it to success No cause in the history of modern Bengal inspired a nobler literature, a mightier sacrifice than the anti-partition agitation And yet

these patriotic young men at Aligarh—that they honour the memory of Sir Sayad himself by building

A GREATER ALIGARH

—a new Aligarh Did not that great Muslim Leader want “*a National University independent of Government control or influence*”? Did he not criticise the Government controlled Universities which he said gave ‘the Nation only bands of certificated beggars and slaves’

The Government's Resolution will, I believe be followed soon by a rigorous policy of repression. In condemning non violent Non Co operation as unconstitutional, the Government denies us the fundamental right to withhold Co-operation from Government. Will the Nation surrender this right? The Resolution gives a warning to the country —If the ‘sane and moderate citizens can not kill the Movement, if the ‘danger’ of Non Co operation is not ‘dissipated’ then must the *sircar* employ ‘repressive action’ in the ‘last resort’! This is the *sircar's* plain intent and purpose. The movement cannot be killed by a ‘moderate’ combination. And we should expect a rigorous policy of repression. And then,—what then? One thing I feel sure of. The youth

THE HUNGARIAN MODERATES

To them answered an ardent Nationlist "Your laws are violated, yet your mouths remain closed Woe, woe to the Nation which raises no protest when its rights are outraged ; it contributes to its own slavery by its silence. The Nation, which submits to injustice without protest, is doomed."

Such, too, is the feeling of the younger generation in this country. They have glimpsed the beauty of the Ideal. They love India's honour. They carry in their hearts the vision and the dream of freedom. And they recognise that the Struggle is not merely 'political.' The Government feels nervous at the spectacle of students leaving affiliated schools and colleges ; the Government resolution says "the youth of the country" are being "sacrificed to emergencies of a political campaign." And there be some parents, too, who share the view of the Government. They are staggered at this new experiment of non-cooperation. There are some who attack our young men as 'ill-bred' and 'unmannerly.' There are some who think with Col. Wedgwood that in asking for *swaraj* we wish to 'run' before we are able to 'walk' and to 'fly' when we cannot 'run' ! But the Nation's youth know better. They have faith in the People ; they have faith in freedom. They know that the struggle in which the country is involved is not a political campaign, they know it is a struggle to guard faith and freedom. They know.—

these patriotic young men at Aligarh—that they honour the memory of Sir Sayad himself by building

A GREATER ALIGARH

—a new Aligarh Did not that great Muslim Leader want “*a National University independent of Government control or influence*”? Did he not criticise the Government controlled Universities which, he said gave ‘the Nation only bands of certificated beggars and slaves’

The Government's Resolution will, I believe be followed soon by a rigorous policy of repression In condemning non violent Non Co operation as unconstitutional, the Government denies us the fundamental right to withhold Co operation from Government Will the Nation surrender this right? The Resolution gives a warning to the country —If the ‘sane and moderate citizens can not kill the Movement, if the ‘danger’ of Non Co operation is not ‘dissipated’ then must the *sircar* employ ‘repressive action’ in the ‘last resort’! This is the *sircar's* plain intent and purpose The movement cannot be killed by a ‘moderate’ combination And we should expect a rigorous policy of repression And then,—what then? One thing I feel sure of The youth of Italy under Mazzini and the youth of Egypt under Zaglul Pasha could not be crushed by coercion, and India's youth no repression can vanquish They adore the Mother

THEY HAVE VOWED

in the Temples of their hearts that India's bonds shall be broken. And in their agony will be born, I believe, a new strength for the Nation. And they will achieve what no armies can,—the Freedom of India.

THE SONG IN MY HEART.

At the skirts of a village I stand,
Peopling its solitudes with my sorrows
And the prayer for my native land.
The wind was strong, the river was rough ;
But stronger, rougher is the storm in my heart.
The birds sing out their song ,
The stars burn their mighty message of old ,
But my heart is wild with sorrow for my native land.

(2)

I have not wished to worship the world ,
From the city's wealth and power have I turned
To find my home in the hearts of the poor,
And my riches in the songs of the simple folk ,
I have seen wonder in their eyes but sorrow in their
lives ;
The song in my heart is riven with a storm ;
And my place is no more at the *majlis*
Of the proud and strong.

(3)

For lettered are the millions of India ,
Yet to her He gave a message, a song, a *Dharma*,
Usung by Greece or Rome ;
And India cannot sing her God-given song
Until her people are free.
Alas ! They lie to-day among the poorest and
the last,
Strangers in their Father's soil,

1. **রাজনীতি**—শ্রীমৎ দ্বাগী প্রজ্ঞানানন্দ সরস্বতী
 ডাক্তার শ্রীপ্রমথ নাথ বন্দ্যোপাধ্যায় লিখিত ভূমিকা সহিত। 'মূল্য ৩।'
 প্রাচ্য ও পাশ্চাত্য রাষ্ট্রনৈতিক মতের তুলনামূলক আলোচনা।

2. **Non-co operation and Students**

Containing writings and speeches of some of our
 leaders e. g. Mahatma Gandhi, Mr. C. F. Andrews,
 Sri Bipin Chandra Paul and Prof. Vaswanti, on this all
 important subject

Price 6 annas only

Saraswati Library
 9 Ramanath Mazumdar Street
 CALCUTTA

Swarajya Series No. 3.

Behave Like Men.

(OPEN LETTERS.)

(Mahatma Gandhi, Lalaji, O. R. Das, Tagore & others)

COMPILED & EDITED

BY

UPENDRA NATH KAR GUPTA.

SARASWATI LIBRARY.

Price Three

Behave Like Men.

(OPEN LETTERS.)

— . 0 . —

COMPILED & EDITED.

BY

UPENDRA NATH KAR GUPTA,

Published by

MANORANJAN GUPTA, B. A.

SARASWATY LIBRARY,

9, Rani Nath Mazumdar St.,

College Sq., Calcutta

Price Three Annas.

আমাদের প্রকাশিত

I রাজনীতি—স্বামী প্রজ্ঞানানন্দ সবস্বতী দ্বিত। প্রাচ ও পাশ্চাত্য রাজনৈতিকমতসমূহের তুলনামূলক আলোচনা। বাংলা ভাষায় এই প্রথম। নানা সংবাদ পত্রে উচ্চপ্রশংসিত।
মূল্য ১৫।

Swarajya series —

1. Non-co-operation and Students by Mahatma Gandhi and others. Price 4as.

(Revised and enlarged 2nd edition) First edition exhausted in a month.

2. Non-co-operation & National Idealism by Prof. T. L. Vaswami. Price 6as

3. Non-co-operation in Other Lands
(Egypt) (In the press)

A vivid picture of the Egyptian struggle for freedom!

4. অর্থ—স্বরাজ সঙ্গীত— মূল্য ১০ আনা।

5. সহযোগিতা-বর্জন প্রস্তাব—প্রকাশ চন্দ্র মহাস্থান—
এম, এ, বি, এল,

6. স্বরাজের পথে-অসহযোগ—

অধ্যাপক—শ্রীঅনিল বরণ রাই এম, এ,

PREAMBLE.

What India wants, what she thinks and her aims at the present crisis are expressively brought to light by these letters published in the leading organs of our country.

Further introduction of these letters is mere ado on my part as their authors are well-known throughout the length and breadth of India—they are leaders of public opinion in the country who by their undaunted zeal and true patriotic sacrifice have advanced the cause of India's awakening, and attaining the ultimate goal.

Dated 2nd March,
1921

} Upendra Nath Kar Gupta,
Basudebpara.
Vagya-Kutir.
Barisal.

Printed By—

J Ghose

Katyayani Press

CALCUTTA

"BEHAVE LIKE MEN."

Dear Friends,

How can I tell you what I feel at the present moment about the situation in the Punjab? My heart is full though my tongue is dumb. I wish I had wings to fly and reach the dear land I love above everything else. I have tried my very best to be with you but I have failed. I do not wish to be a martyr but I long to be of use to you in your troubles. The most that I can do is to advise you in the light of the knowledge that I have and the experience that I have gathered. Listen, weigh, decide and determine.

My heart is bitter, my soul is sore, I am filled with anger at the doings of the bureaucracy but even more so at the conduct and behaviour of my own countrymen. It is the latter whom I hold responsible for all the sufferings and the shame that you have been afflicted with. All honour to the leaders who stood by you and have suffered. They are not responsible for the excesses of the mob. The responsibility of the latter's deeds lies on the

heads of those who have kept aloof, who always keep aloof where there is risk, to be run, who provoke others to do deeds of violence but themselves keep behind the *purdah*, who are patriots when the sun shines but cynics when there is an occasion to act. "I can write pages and pages in their 'honour', but I will not do so. If there ever was a time when there was need for restraint it is the present. "I will therefore restrain myself and come to the point direct.

The first thing that I ask of you is to stand by the leaders who have suffered for you, regardless of caste, creed and party—Harkishan Lal, Duni Chand, Ram Bhuj Dutt, Satya Pal, Kichlu, Amar Nath, Mohan Lal, Mangal Sen, Labh Singh, Sarb Dyar, Mutiullah, Krishna and others whose names I do not at present know. You know that I have differed from them in the past, differed seriously about their policy, their work and their behaviour. But at the present time the only thing that I wish to remember is that they are the victims of the reactionary policy of the Punjab government; that their crime is patriotism. As such they are all dear to me and I pay to them the homage that is due to suffering and bleeding patriotism. I have forgotten all their personal weaknesses and faults. At the present moment the only thing that

matters is their suffering. Henceforth I shall worship them. I do not wish to make any invidious distinction but there is one person among this group of whom I must speak separately—my dear friend, Duni Chand. Where in the land of the five rivers is there a person nobler, truer, purer, and bolder than Duni Chand? Having neither wealth nor excessive talents, nor an extended practice at his back, the man has fought single handed for high principles and noble practices, for the rights of the poor against the rich, for pure democracy, against great odds. I have had the privilege of working with him in the Municipal Committee, in the Indian Association, and in the Congress. I can truthfully say that I never come across a more disinterested and high-minded public man than Duni Chand. To his children and to his wife my heart goes forth in full sympathy.

Young Punjbees, I wish you to stand by your suffering leaders, bravely, nobly and in pure spirit. In the past, we have not always done that and hence our misfortunes and troubles. Let me assure you that the source of mischief lies in our own chicken-heartedness, in our timidity, in our selfishness and egotism, in our inconstancy and disloyalty to our friends, and not in any thing that our leaders

have done or said' The Pūnjabees' are generous people, they are brave and noble hearted but somewhat lacking in loyalty of love and comradeship' In the past we have often deserted our comrades and mingled our voice of denunciation disapproval, and disapprobation with the voices of our enemies Our enemies are very clever, astute, cunning, diplomatic and powerful. They know how to inoculate innocent and inexperienced minds with the poison of distrust and suspicion ; they know how to play on the instincts of self preservation, self interest and egotism ; they know how to appeal to the desire of gain and safety inherent in every human being ; they know how to divide and split We have in the past played in their hands too much. Shall we not learn from bitter experience and avoid the mistakes of the past ? We have amongst us many a person who speaks into your confidence, only to betray you, who beguiles you with offers of help and intercession, who appeals to you in the name of prudence and patriotism. Take note of these persons and keep clear of them. Then we have amongst us many a person truly noble and patriotic, *needed to institutions.* Remember that institutions are only means to ends. They are for us and not we for them. A people morally high alive to a sense of responsibility, self-sacrificing

and ready to suffer for principle and for causes can raise institutions but a people morally degraded, dead to a sense of honour, devoid of a spirit of comradeship, of constancy and loyalty to friends and co-workers, always ready to compromise, and temporize, ready to change their principles in every emergency cannot in the long run save institutions. Institutions cannot instil life, cannot be a source of inspiration, unless led by men of life and spirit. Stick to your institutions, keep them, save them, stand by them, in every way you can, but never let your higher natures be drowned in the sea of anxiety to save them at the cost of everything else. Remember we are in a stage of transition. Actual success in figures whether in the field of social organization, in that of education or even in that of politics, does not matter so much as the spirit by which the nation is permeated and inspired. We were once the wealthiest people on earth, most learned, best educated, but the moment we became dispirited we lost everything. Do not, then, let yourself be deceived by figures and numbers. Do not let your *morale* and your *spirit* suffer for the sake of institutions, and numbers and figures. Let your spirit stand high and undefiled and uncorrupted though lonely.

Pardon me for this sermon. In my judgment this was necessary. I am told that the Punjab is dead and demoralized. All public life has ceased to function and everybody is afraid. Lawyers have refused to defend "political offenders" and newspapers have ceased publication. Friendship, love, sympathy, comradeship and fellow feeling have all disappeared. Every one is for himself and the devil for the rest. I can picture the conditions I saw something of that kind in 1907 and then in 1910. But this time blow has been the hardest and consequently the knock-out most complete. Our enemies are rejoicing and jubilant, our 'friends' silent, and cynically apportioning blame on this or that. Some find fault with Gandhi, others with others.

Young Punjabees ! I appeal to you with all the earnestness which I can command to throw off this demoralization, this spirit of fault-finding, this lowness of *morale*, this cynicism and this worship of self. Stand by your transported and imprisoned leaders, enshrine the names and qualities of those that have died or have to die ; give them all the sympathy and help you can ; honour and revere them. Your sympathy and appreciation strengthen their soul and help them in bearing their

misfortunes but above all be up and doing. Re-build your public life, start your newspapers, revive your political associations, and educate and organize your people. I do not want you not do that in a spirit of revenge or hatred. Do not let your system be poisoned by hate. Avoid and eschew all kinds of violence—of intention, speech or deed. *We are neither fit nor ripe for a militant revolutionary struggle.* We want a revolution, but not of force or violence. *We want a change of heart and a transformation of brains.* What we need is not violence but firmness, not vacillation but determination, not expediency and time-serving but principles and a resolution to stand by them, come what may. Do not worry about your rich men. Let them do as they please. *Organize the middle class, the peasants and the workers.* Do not talk to them of hatred and revenge, nor of force and violence, but of co-operation and consolidation, of their rights and their duties, of the necessity of organization and education, of the duty of taking a broader view of things and developing a comprehensive outlook, of the necessity of sacrificing the individual for the community and the community for the nation. Let your newspapers avoid violent language, at the same time keeping clear of sycophancy, flattery and

praises of the authorities that be. We want solid truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth. Let your Hindu Sabhas and Moslem Leagues take care of themselves. *They are to a great extent responsible for all your troubles.* Avoid all such organizations. Their basis is false, their propaganda untrue, their example poisonous and their company demoralizing. Give up all religious, credal and communal controversies, at least for a time. Cultivate the spirit of fellowship on national political and economic basis. Organize, educate and agitate. Form yourselves into self denying groups. Fill your minds with sound knowledge and start newspapers and magazines, not for profit but for education.

In my judgment Mr. Gandhi is the best leader you have just now. Imbibe his spirit and follow his lead. Suffer patiently, firmly and manfully, when you have to suffer. Do not cry like children "that man did it, he told me, he misled me, he is at fault and not I." Behave like men. Remember the Sikh Gurus who have left the most ennobling example, you have in your history of suffering for principle. I am sorry I cannot help you directly but I will do all that I can with tongue, pen and money, even though I may not be with you in body. I will beg, borrow and steal for you. I will work for you and send you what I

earn. Let it not be said of the Punjabees of the early twentieth century that they were so poor in spirit that one blow crushed them completely and demoralized them irretrievably.

One with you in sorrow and grief.

LALPAT RAI.

New York City

U. S. A. 1400 Broadway.

August 25th, 1919

AN OPEN LETTER TO LORD SINHA.

Governor of Behar and Orissa

My Lord of Raipur,

We were surprised last week, to read your remarkable speech about your Government's Excise Revenues, but we were hardly prepared for this latest effusion, the Rainey Circular. Ever since your appointment to the Behar Gadi, we had believed that you would try to keep pace with the bureaucratic rulers of India, but we have never expected that you would outpace and outdistance them from the very start. We have never misunderstood the motives which underlay your appointment but we have never allowed ourselves to think that you would so soon make yourself an object of pity and ridicule. You talk, my Lord, as a certain young Zamindar talked a few years ago when in speaking of the English connection, he conveyed to the then Viceroy the pompous assurance that his "relations with the British Raj were cordial and friendly." You seem to think that the government which you are supposed to administer is your own "national" government. Is the erst-while leader of the Calcutta Bar

unable to recognise the elementary fact that the present administration of India is essentially British, by the British and for the British, and that he and its other Indian officers are paid to carry on that character of the administration. You say that your government is not afraid to strike, and that it can not tolerate the charge of cowardice being made against it. Well said, my Lord, why not strike at once, strike deep and dead at your brothers and sisters as even Dyer or O'Dwyer did not strike, so that history may hereafter record the glorious fact that an Indian did in India what Englishmen were afraid of doing, that an Indian struck where Englishmen were chivalrous enough not to strike, and that an Indian crushed and destroyed the last stand for freedom which his countrymen and country-women had made. That, my Lord, would be the crowing act of a subject ruler. You probably do not wish it to be thought of you that you have been faithless to the great trust which England has reposed in you. I do not know how you would like being thought faithless to your country—that is a matter of temperament—but does that trust contain any compact that you will go ahead of the other Provincial rules and smother the political life of India out of sight? You probably expect the Englishmen will approve of your courageous administration. I doubt not, my

Lord, that the noble lords and ladies of England will applaud and pat you, that news will come flashing over the cables that your appointment had been an unqualified success and that here our friends of the Anglo-Indian press will come out with blazing editorials, but they will not appreciate the morality of your administration, and out of your sight and hearing they will smile and chuckle too. Your I. C. S. Officers will probably no longer threaten wholesale resignation, but they are all men who, whatever their faults, are filled with a passionate love for their own country, who would any where and in any circumstances stand by their country and countrymen to a man, and who would not, in their heart of hearts grudge respect to those who respect themselves. You charge the Non-co-operation movement as one inciting directly to violence and you charge its promoters and supporters with misrepresentations. You have dealt with and sifted evidence the best part of your life. Would you cite your evidence for these propositions? Do you not know that every Non-co-operation speaker has from every platform pleaded and is still pleading for non-violence? Misrepresentations, my Lord, is gentle perversion of truth and I make bold to say that it is the grossest misrepresentation to say that the Non-co-operation movement is designed to incite to violence. It is a movement designed

to teach one to respect himself and his country, and to eradicate a nation's slave mentality. It is a movement herest of all selfish motives and demands renunciation and sacrifices from its voterics. It is a movement which seeks to purify unclean minds and souls and which, even if it fails, will have advanced the country's political education by a hundred years and lastly, my Lord, it is the only movement open to a subject nation to adopt to vindicate its national honour and national self-respect.

One last word, my Lord, the path of your life has always been strewn with roses, and you probably do not and cannot understand how we humbler folk feel. But I can assure you that we have got the right feeling in us at last, and that we will move on to our goal without and inspite of your Lordship. In the meantime, my noble Lord, transport yourself for a moment in your mind's eye to the Bar Library at Calcutta, where you were once its idol, and I trow that while you find there some ready to give you some sort of a welcome, you will find others who will turn away from you and refuse to shake hands with you. That will be the most eloquent commentary on your go-ahead administration.

BARODA PRASANNA PYNE.

Bar Library, Howrah, Feb. 20, 1921.

A LETTER TO THE VICEROY.

Against Enormity of Government Measures

The following letter was sent by Sri Rabindranath Tagore to his Excellency the Viceroy.

Your Excellency,

The enormity of the measures taken by the Government in the Punjab for quelling some local disturbances has with a rude shock, revealed to our minds the helplessness of our position as British subjects in India. The disproportionate severity of the punishments inflicted upon the unfortunate people and methods of carrying them out, we are convinced, are without parallel in the history of civilised Governments, barring some conspicuous exceptions, recent and remote. Considering that such treatment has been meted out to a population disarmed and resourceless, by a power which has the most terribly efficient organisation for destruction of human lives, we must strongly assert that it can claim no political expediency, far less moral justification. The accounts of insults and sufferings undergone by our brothers in the Punjab have trickled through

the gagged silence, reaching every corner of India and the universal agony of indignation roused in the hearts of our people has been ignored by our rulers,—possibly congratulating themselves for imparting, what they imagine as, salutary lessons. This callousness has been praised by most of the 'Anglo Indian papers, which have in some cases gone to the brutal length of making fun of our sufferings, without receiving the least check from the same authority, relentlessly careful in smothering every cry of pain and expression of judgment from the organs representing the sufferers. Knowing that our appeals have been in vain and that the passion of vengeance is blinding the noble vision of statesmanship in our Government, which could so easily afford to be magnanimous as befitting its physical strength and moral tradition the very least that I can do for my country is to take all consequences upon myself in giving voice to the protest of the million of my countrymen, surprised into a dumb anguish of terror. The time has come when badges of honour make our shame glaring in their incongruous context of humiliation and I for my part wish to stand shorn of all special distinctions by the side of those of my countrymen who, for their so called insignificance, are liable to suffer a degradation not fit for human beings. And

these are the reasons which have painfully compelled me to ask your Excellency, with due deference and regret to release me of my title of Knighthood, which I had the honour to accept from His Majesty the King at the hands of your predecessor for whose nobleness of heart I still entertain great admiration

Yours faithfully,
Rabindranath Tagore

TO EVERY ENGLISHMAN IN INDIA.

Dear Friend,

I wish that every Englishman will see this appeal and give thoughtful attention to it.

Let me introduce myself to you. In my humble opinion, no Indian has co-operated with the British Government more than I have for an unbroken period of twenty-nine years of public life in the face of circumstances that might well have turned any other man into a rebel. I ask you to believe me when I tell you that my co-operation was not based on the fear of the punishments provided by your laws or any other selfish motives. It was free and voluntary co-operation based on the belief that the sum total of the activity of the British Government was for the benefit of India. I put my life in peril four times for the sake of the Empire,-- at the time of the Boer War when I was in charge of the Ambulance Corps whose work was mentioned in General Buller's dispatches; at the time of the Zulu revolt in Natal when I was in charge of a similar corps; at the time of the commencement of the late war when I raised an Ambulance Corps and as a result of the strenuous training had a severe attack of pleurisy, and lastly,

in fulfilment of my promise to Lord Chelmsford at the War Conference in Delhi I threw myself in such an active recruiting campaign in Kaira district involving long and trying marches that I had an attack of dysentery, which proved almost fatal. I did all this in the full belief that acts such as mine must gain for my country an equal status in the Empire. So late as last December I pleaded hard for a trustful co operation. I fully believed that Mr Lloyd George would redeem his promise to the Musalmans and that the revelations of the official atrocities in the Punjab would secure full reparation for the Punjabees. But the treachery of Mr. Lloyd George and its appreciation by you, and the condonation of the Punjab atrocities have completely shattered my faith in the good intentions of the Government and the nation which is supporting it.

But though my faith in your good intentions is gone, I recognise your bravery, and I know that what you will not yield to justice and reason, you will gladly yield to bravery.

See what this Empire means to India.—

Exploitation of India's resources for the benefit of Great Britain.

An ever increasing military expenditure, and a civil service, the most expensive in the world.

Extravagant working of every department in utter disregard of India's poverty.

Disarmament and consequent emasculation of a whole nation lest an armed nation might imperil the lives of a handful of you in our midst.

Traffic in intoxicating liquors and drugs for the purpose of sustaining a top-heavy administration.

Progressively repressive legislation in order to suppress an ever growing agitation seeking to give expression to a nation's agony.

Degrading treatment of Indians residing in your dominions.

And you have shown total disregard of our feelings by glorifying the Punjab administration and flouting the Musalman sentiment.

I know you would not mind if we could fight and wrest the sceptre from your hands. You know that we are powerless to do that, for you have ensured our incapacity to fight in open and honourable battle. Bravery on the battle field is thus impossible for us. Bravery of the soul still remains open to us. I know you will respond to that also. I am engaged in evoking that bravery. Non-cooperation means nothing less than training in self-sacrifice. Why should we cooperate with you when we know that by your administration of this great country we are being daily enslaved in an increasing degree. This response of the people to my appeal is not due to my personality. I would

like you dismiss me, and for that matter the Ali brothers too, from your consideration. My personality will fail to evoke any response to anti-Muslim cry if I were foolish enough to raise it, as the magic name of the Ali Brothers would fail to inspire the Musalmans with enthusiasm if they were madly to raise an anti-Hindu cry. People flock in their thousands to listen to us because we to-day represent the voice of a nation groaning under your iron heels. The Ali brothers were your friends as I was, and still am, my religion forbids me to bear any ill-will towards you. I would not raise my hand against you even if I had power. I expect to conquer you only by my suffering. The Ali brothers will certainly draw the sword, if they could, in defence of their religion and their country. But they and I have made common cause with the people of India in their attempt to voice their feelings and to find remedy for their distress.

You are in search of a remedy to suppress this rising ebullition of national feeling. I venture to suggest to you that the only way to suppress it is to remove the causes. You have yet the power. You can repent of the wrongs done to Indians. You can compel Mr. Lloyd George to redeem his promises. I assure you he has kept many escape-doors. You can compel the Viceroy to retire in favour of a better one, you can revise your ideas

about Sir Michael O'Dwyer¹ and General Dyer. You can compel the Government to summon a conference of the recognised leaders of the people, duly elected by them and representing all shades of opinion so as to devise means for granting 'Swaraj' in accordance with the wishes of the people of India.

But this you cannot do unless you consider every Indian to be in reality your equal and brother. I ask for no patronage, I merely point out to you, as a friend, an honourable solution, namely repression, is open to you. I prophesy that it will fail. It has begun already. The Government has already imprisoned two brave men of Panipat for holding and expressing their opinions freely. Another is on his trial in Lahore for having expressed similar opinions. One in the Oudh district is already imprisoned. Another awaits judgment. You should know what is going on in anticipation of repression. I invite you respectfully to choose the 'better way and make common cause with the people of India whose salt you are eating. To seek to thwart their aspirations is disloyalty to the country.

I am,
Your faithful friend,
M. K. Gandhi.

AN OPEN LETTER.

To H. R. H. The Duke of Connaught, K. G.,
Bombay.

May it please Your Royal Highness,

You have delivered to India H. M.'s message. Courtiers have received it eulogistically; the masses have kept away studiously.

You are shown the India of Princes and Autocrats, of Zemindars and Bureaucrats, of soldiers and sportsmen. But the India of famishing farmers, of sweating labourers on plantations, of hard pressed coolies in coal mines and of forced labour in forests is shut out from your vision! Nor are you brought into touch with that awakening, aspiring, enlightened and independent India, that strives and struggles for Truth, for Freedom, for National Emancipation, and for Universal Brotherhood.

To-day you find India estranged. Pray why? Repressive Acts and suppressive measures, persecution and humiliation, exploitation and deportation—these indignities and injuries heaped on India after her loyal rally in the war, have so alienated from the bureaucracy:—

(a) That Dr. Tagore renounced his knight-hood;

(b) Sir Sankaran Nair resigned from the Viceroy's Executive Council ; and

(c) Mr. Jinnah, Mr. Sarma and Pandit Malaviya resigned from the old Legislative Council. So, if India is estranged to-day, the fault does not lie with India. It is the bureaucracy that is clearly accountable and answerable for it.

You have appealed to India to "forgive and unite." But how can she respond to your call,

- (1) When her hands are bound by the Press Act ;
- (2) Her tongue by the Seditious Meetings Act ;
- (3) And her person by Regulation III of 1818 ;
- (4) When her mind is embarrassed with the breach of pledges given to the Mussalmans of India ;
- (5) When her system is bled by the Currency and Exchange policy of the Government of India ;
- (6) , And when her heart is withering with the pangs of the firing, flogging and crawling in the Punjab in 1919.

Even the attitude of your Parliament has been most cutting,

- (1) Dyer was praised ;
- (2) O'Dwyer was exonerated ;
- (3) And Lord Chelmsford was extolled for the part they played in the Punjab tragedy ! Does H. M.'s message provide any balm or relief to suffering India ? None whatever.

Then how do you expect India "to forgive and unite" ? Do you know how your appeal is responded to by the bureaucracy ?

(1) Lala Lajpat Rai is shut out from Rawalpindi ;

(2) Mazharul Huq is kept out of Arrah ;

(3) And Yakub Hassan is arrested and sentenced at Calicut. So, in the north, east, south and west of India, the bureaucracy has resumed its rigorous activities, even while you are in India. And the leaders are dealt with so summarily. Is this the beginning of the new era ? Do you still blame India for her studied aloofness ? How can she co-operate ? With whom can she co-operate ? On what common ground can she co-operate ?

Noble Duke, if you are really anxious to know the true position of India to-day, please interview the Great Gandhiji, Rev. Andrews, Swami Shradhananda and Moulana-Abdul Bari, before you leave these shores.

And as you say you are an old and true and trusted friend of India, please convey to H. M. *the universal demand of all India* :—(1) To repeal the Rowlatt Act, the Press Act, the Seditious Meetings Act and Regulation III of 1818. (2) To punish the Punjab offenders and discontinue their pensions, to refund and cancel the fines imposed on the Punjab districts and release the Punjab

political prisoners (3) To revise the Currency and Exchange policy as required by India's representatives. (4) , To fulfil the pledges given by Lord Hardinge and the Right Hon'ble Mr. Lloyd George to the Moslems of India. (5) And to recognise the rights of Indians as equal citizens of the country and the Common-wealth

Noble Duke, your mission to India, as the son of your Mother, as the uncle of the King, and as the representative of your race cannot be deemed to be complete, unless you use your good offices in England to effect these changes in Indian administration without which there can never be peace in this land

May Heaven help you, Noble Duke,

Yours deferentially,

BARJORJI FRAMJI BHARUCHA.

Bombay,

19th February 1927

AN ENGLISH LADY ON NON- CO-OPERATION.

FROM.

MISS HELENA NORMANTON.

(Ex editor of "India")

22, Mecklenburgh Square, W. C.

September 15th 1920.

Dear Mr. Gandhi,

As a convert from the polar opposite to Non-Co-operation, I venture to send you a few observations upon that policy, and do so in the form of an open letter to you because it has been my high honour and serious responsibility until recently to edit "India", the official organ of the Indian National Congress. Hence, it is possible that the reasons by which I have been led to your policy may have some little interest for believers in Indian self Government

As late as December 1912, I was upon the whole a hesitating believer in Indian co-operation with the Government of India Act. Its grave inadequacy had been borne in upon me in the course of sedulous attendances at all the Joint Select Committee sessions and at the Debates in Commons and Lords, but it

seems to me that if India held aloof from it her lack of enthusiasm might be construed by the world at large as an apathetic and oriental unfitness for democratic political life. When however the news of the Punjab Tragedy was revealed on December 13th last after long months of concealment, it became obvious that India could only co-operate with any dignity upon two conditions viz —

(1) That Britain should redeem her own honour and make amends by sternly proportioned measures of justice upon the Punjab offenders.

(2) That as an earnest of good will and appeasement towards afflicted Mahomedan India she should use her undoubted predominance in the supreme Council to obtain as lenient terms as possible to vanquished Turkey. It was a special case for special treatment. It was the numerically greatest Mahomedan power dealing with the spiritually supreme one.

Neither of these two conditions has been observed. The Punjab arch-offenders have even been praised and their commander is still Secretary of State for India. Turkey has been harshly dealt with

It has become therefore the duty of every loyal Indian to do whatever he can to prove that he will not in servility lick the hand that has lashed him. A zeal to work the Reforms, which leave the Central

Government untouched in its tyrannical powers immediately after the greatest demonstration of that tyranny, the express denial in Parliament of a Charter of Rights, and the degradation of the Khilafat, would be treachery to the very soul of India or of any nation fit for liberty. It is quite possible that India's Non-Co-operation will be misrepresented and misconstrued for a time, but that is a risk she must take. The penalty of political-courage has ever been misconception,

I foreshadow, however, a graver risk than misconception and slander. It is that you will have followers who will cause confusion in the eyes of outside nations by adopting the easy and less vital elements in your policy in order to camouflage their non-adoption of the one essential thing, *The crux of the whole matter is abstention from working the new Councils under the Government of India Act.* I write this in ignorance of any detailed knowledge of what part or parts of your policy the Special Congress has just adopted, but a child could have foreseen that the self seeking type of political climber would be willing enough for others to renounce their titles or refrain from entering the army or Police—he himself could easily enough renounce such a career—and would like well enough any sort of non-co-operation which did not interfere with his own personal advancement. If there be any such,

these would be the ones who would sell the pass into the enemy's hands. Why? Because in political strategy one must always consider what the enemy desires and not do it; also what the enemy does not desire and do that. It is obvious that Britain's face would be saved by even half a dozen prominent Congressmen who would enter the Legislative Councils. I therefore earnestly hope that until the conditions noted above are fulfilled, no Indian worth the name will sell his country for a pin or two of power and I prophesy that any who do so will not long retain the respect of the Congress, but will soon be as much a laughing-stock in India as in England. And I hope that political India will be alive to the danger of any policy whereby one province or constituency might co-operate whilst another might not. Such a course would merely prove India not to be a nation and would adorn the imperialistic motto "Divide et impera" with fresh possibilities.

It is quite possible that ultra re-actionary opinion was brought to consent to the passage of the Act by the consideration that the (pretended) Self-Government of India would achieve another vote for the British Empire upon the League of Nations governing authority. The mask could be torn from this pretence only if India solidly proved by *complete* Non Co-operation that she did not

assert to the denial of self-government by opening it in its hollow outer forms. If she works the Act, with what consistency can she ever demonstrate its futility to the League of Nations' Tribunal?

It is quite a question whether Non-Co-operation does not logically entrain the winding up of the British Committee of the Congress, in its present form. With what self-respect can India continue to maintain her propagandist activities in England, at any rate as things are now? That the former head of the Congress Executive in London the most stalwart champion of constant advance in Indian policy that I know, should have been superseded by a new chairman who is an avowed and an ardent co operationist has been the main reason of my resignation of the editorship of "India," for I feel the position would be simply absurd, the paper to speak with one voice and the chairman with another. India would probably achieve far better results at less costs by sending her representative men to arouse a sisterly sympathy and agitation in the self-governing Dominions than by giving a fictitious importance to whatever small groups of Indians may be fortuitously resident in London at any given moment. Speaking from a long and inner experience of the propaganda conducted by suffrage and other societies, I estimate that Indian Congress propaganda in England obtains

about three shillings worth of value for every pound expended. Even the newspaper "India" is to a large extent wasted effort, because of a lack of application of scientific distributive principles due presumably to lack of knowledge upon the business and directorial side of the paper, with the exception of the superseded Chairman, Dr. Clark. The mere fact that Mr. B. G. Horniman has never been allowed to join the Directorate and that his nomination by Dr. Clark for honorary office in the Committee was turned down shows which way the wind blows in London.

Whenever a Tilak, a Gandhi, a B. C. Pal, a Lajpat Rai, a Madhava Rao, a Rangaswami Iyengar or a Mrs. Naibu or any really eminent and capable Indian orator or statesman may visit England, there will always be a public ready to hear them, and the existence or non-existence of the present British Committee would not affect that in any way. But I have strongly felt for some time that what is really required in England is a group of eminent Britons united by an ardent love of the cause of India and ready to demonstrate it by financially meeting their own committee's expenses. Advice could be freely sought from the All-India Congress Committee and from eminent Indian Congressmen, but its status with regard to the Congress should be of parallel not of subservient rank. It should be able to offer gene-

rous and independent advice and if need be, occasional criticism, as one true friend may to another and be really a British Committee, on the alert for the advancement of India's good, able to speak with authority and to command respect. Upon such a body eminent British men and women could serve with dignity and not merely lend the hollow lustre of an absentee membership to a rubber-stamp body. It would be essential that if any Indian Consultative Board in London should co-operate with it, it should be purely in an advisory capacity, entirely without power to regulate its personnel at elections otherwise even such a regenerated British Committee would become merely a held for intrigue. For the British Committee, Indians should be ineligible, except upon the salaried staff, where they could be invaluable. But the day has probably gone by for a mixed body, avowedly dependent upon Congress funds to exert any marked effect upon British opinion, and it is questionable whether the present system—I attack no individual—does not to some extent cheapen rather than raise Congress Prestige in England. One definite executive Indian agent of the Congress could probably transact whatever little business would remain after that dignified withdrawal from London which would be the logical corollary of Non-co-operation.

In conclusion I would reiterate that my whole

hearted congratulations and good will go out to the Indian National Congress for its adoption of a strong policy, but that, for that policy to have any success whatever in starting the British mind, Non-co-operation with the new Legislative Councils is essential, vital and imperative. Nothing else will be taken seriously outside India.

Yours in love for the Indian cause

HELENA NORMANTON,

(Ex-editor, "INDIA")

LETTER TO THE PRESS.

To day Just as the train stopped at Mymensingh the Sub-Divisional Officer of Sadar South entered my compartment and served me with an order of the Additional District Magistrate which purported to be under Sec. 144 of the Code of Criminal Procedure directing me to abstain from entering the town of Mymensingh. At that time I had already entered the town as the train passed a good portion of the town before it reached the station. The reasons assigned in the order are firstly that I was likely to 'disturb' public tranquility by encouraging unauthorised processions. Secondly, that I was likely to disturb public tranquility by attempting to disturb those engaged in the lawful business and attending the Matriculation Examination. As regards the first ground I knew nothing of any procession authorised or unauthorised and if the Magistrate had really received any information to that effect I must characterise that information as absolutely untrue. As regards the second ground, I intended to address a public meeting and I intended to say at that meeting that Matriculation students should abstain from appearing or continuing to appear at that examination. It is undoubtedly my legal right to advise the students

TEXT OF THE MAGISTRATE'S ORDER.

The following is the text of the order served upon Desh-Bandhu Chittaranjan Das under Sec 144 Cr P. C by the Addl District Magistrate of Mymensingh —“Whereas, I have been informed that you C. R. Das, Bar at Law are likely to disturb public tranquility by encouraging unauthorised processions within the town of Mymensingh and attempting to disturb those engaged in this lawful business in holding and attending the Matriculation Examination now being held in the town which place is within the local limits of my jurisdiction and whereas in my opinion immediate prevention and speedy remedy are desirable, I do hereby direct you to abstain from entering the town of Mymensingh as I consider that such direction is likely to prevent disturbance of the public tranquility.

Sd. D. VAUGHAN,
Addl District Magistrate,
Mymensingh.

2nd March, 1921.

শ্রীঅনন্তকুমার কব গুপ্ত কৃত ২৫

- ১। মতিব্রজ (গল্প) —
২। ভালভামাতা (গল্প) ১ ২ ৩
৩। সেবাহরতা উপহাস

শীঘ্রই প্রকাশিত হইবে।

have taken place in all three countries where the British have their sway—Ireland, Egypt and India respectively, containing three different peoples widely different in their civilization, temperament and tradition. Is it unthinkable that the mischief-maker may be lurking somewhere in the common element which they all have, namely, the one people which governs them? It is not in the system of government or the law but in the men entrusted with the carrying on of the government, the men who have not the imagination or sympathy truly to know the people whom they rule, the men who imagine that it is their material power which carries its own permanence in itself, and that therefore the eternal truths of human nature and moral providence can be ignored in its favour. It is evident that these people in their blind pride will ever go on seeking for the source of mischief outside themselves, and easily succeed in catching some stray dog to give it a bad name and hang it. This will only

prolong their period of harboring the mischief in their own person and driving deeper into their constitution. It is the same kind of ignorance of the eternal laws which primitive peoples show when they hunt for some so-called witch to which they ascribe the cause of their illness while carrying the disease-germs in their own blood. It is quite easy for them to torture and burn the witch and dance the devil-dance with proper ceremony, but the disease will continue and they will have to make costly provisions for more burning of witches and more orgies of frightfulness.

Yours,

RABINDRANATH TAGORE.

— *Philippine Review*, August-September, 1920.

In logic there is a canon of induction called the canon of agreement and difference, which leads to no uncertain conclusion. It is :—

“If two or more instances in which a phenomenon occurs have only one other

circumstance in common, while two or more instances in which it does not occur, have nothing in common but the absence of that circumstance—the circumstance in which alone the two sets of instances differ throughout is the effect or the cause or an indispensable part of the cause of the phenomenon.”

To particularise : Amongst the civilised peoples of the Empire, since Canada, South Africa, and Australia with a healthy political life have only self-government in common, whilst Ireland, Egypt, and India, where the reverse condition obtains, have nothing in common but the absence of self-government, self-government is for them the cause or an indispensable part of the cause of a healthy political life. Here is the remedy, here the grand olixir for their ills, which only blindness can refuse or folly deny.

Bernard Houghton

"India" May 2, 1919.

Non-Co-operation in Egypt.

Vicissitudes of Egypt.

It was not long ago that the celebrated, historian Breasted after concluding his chapters of the glorious deeds of ancient Egypt, lamented the Biblical curse that henceforth there would be no prince of its own on the throne of Egypt

Indeed, after the fall of the last Pharaonic Dynasty, Egypt had not had the good fortune of an independent king of her own. Since then Egypt had been by turn a vassal of Persia, Greece, Rome and lastly of Turkey. From the time when Napoleon landed in Egypt, she became a subject of international jealousies among the European Powers, so they preferred the Turkish Protectorate over her to annexation by any one of themselves. So great was the interest in the Turkish Protectorate that when in the last century Mahomet Ali tried to throw off the Turkish yoke, the Powers came to its rescue. But henceforward a new custom was adopted. The ruler of Egypt who had hitherto been a Vali—Governor—a nominee of the Sultan, now became the Khedive, the hereditary king under the suzerainty of Turkey.

over various branches of the civil administration. A Mixed Tribunal—an international court to try the civil cases where foreigners were concerned—was established. International control was exercised over revenue. The railways and port of Alexandria were next internationalised; and lastly, the enormous landed property of the Khedive came under the same authority. To clinch matters, Ismail Pasha, the then Khedive of Egypt, was deposed in 1879 at the instance of the Powers; and Tewfik who was favourable towards the Europeans was placed in stead.

The Dual Control was established in 1879 lasting for two years, its continuance depending on an army of occupation. The Dual Control was not so backed, hence arose the feasibility of an armed resistance by the inhabitants who found a leader in Arabi Pasha, a minister dismissed at the instance of the European Powers.

The revolt, though ostensibly aimed at the Khedive, had the Europeans, who were gradually assuming tutelage over Egypt, for its objective. Arabi's rising undoubtedly contained the first germ of an Egyptian national movement. But it led to failure owing to defective guidance. Europeans were massacred at Alexandria and British fleet opened fire upon the city. France having declined to co-

operate in suppressing the Egyptian rebels, Great Britain under-took the task single-handed. Lord Wolseley with a force of 5,000 men from India came to Egypt and after a fight at Tel-el-Kebir occupied the country in 1882.

With the occupation of Egypt, Great Britain was confronted by three definite problems relating first to Egypt, next to Turkey and lastly to the Foreign Powers, specially France.

The last one, the international problem which was the fruitful source of much heart-burning, suspicion and petty jealousies, was settled after careful and prolonged diplomatic transactions.

The first act of Lord Granville after occupation was to send circular letters to the Powers in 1883 announcing to them Great Britain's intention of withdrawing from Egypt at the earliest convenience. Lord Cromer was appointed as a High Commissioner in September 1883 to put Egypt in order.

But Lord Cromer found withdrawal from Egypt impossible within a definite space of time. On the contrary his duties, he thought, called for an army of occupation. So there ensued a long chapter of diplomatic wrangles with the Powers, specially with France.

Things were set at rest by the Anglo-French Convention of, 1904, wherein it was distinctly stated that 'France would not obstruct the action of Great Britain in that country (Egypt) by asking, that a 'limit of time be fixed for' the British occupation or 'in any other manner'. Germany, Italy and Spain followed suit in recognising Great Britain's sphere of influence in Egypt. By degrees Lord Cromer diminished the influence of "administrative internationalism" from all branches of administration. But in the Judicial system, the "administrative internationalism" outlived Lord Cromer. It was due to the effect of capitulation—a law which deprived some of the Oriental countries of the jurisdiction over European subjects in civil and criminal cases. They were tried by their own Consuls. In civil cases, the effect of capitulation did not affect Egypt much ; they were tried by Mixed Tribunals composed of Europeans and Egyptians. But in criminal laws 17 powers were to be consulted to effect any change therein. Lord Cromer suggested abolition of capitulation but could not do it.

With regard to Turkey, Great Britain from the very beginning determined to keep her in the back-ground and she kept her so as far as was necessary for her. The Porte was recognised as a

suzerain power , allowed to levy her annual tribute amounting to nearly £ 700,000 ; & permitted to represent the diplomatic relations of Egypt in foreign courts ; and permitted to levy an army. On paper, Great Britain was only an adviser in Egyptian affairs ; but in reality she was much more than that. She was the supreme power in Egypt. But however anomalous and awkward, the position of Great Britain regarding Egypt might have been, before the Declaration of 1914 it never looked unnatural because Turkey was weak and great Britain was strong and the other powers were treaty-bound not to interfere in Egyptian affairs.)

But the position of Great Britain has been altogether changed, since the Declaration of 1914 Turkish Protectorate over Egypt gave place to British Protectorate. The ex-Khedive Abbas Helmi cast in his lot with the Sultán of Turkey in the great war and was deposed. Prince Hussien, a descendant of the celebrated Mhamed Ali, was placed in his stead with the title of Sultán. The British Government accepted exclusive responsibility for the defence of Egypt during the great war. The form of the future Government of Egypt was not settled at that time ; but the British Government regarded themselves as trustees of Egypt. Consistently with the new responsibilities it was decided at that

time that diplomatic transactions of Egypt with the foreign powers should be conducted through the British Representative in Cairo. The question of capitulation was postponed until the end of the war.

It was stated before, that Great Britain had a great problem to solve—her relation with the Egyptians themselves. The status of Great Britain in Egypt was very anomalous. The functions of the Comptroller established in 1876 was limited to investigation and verification only and they were not invested with any administrative or executive powers. The legal position of Great Britain did not improve after the occupation of 1882 when she acted single. In 1883 Lord Granville distinctly stated in his Circular that Great Britain's duty was only to advise the Khedive. But Lord Cromer outstepped law. What law failed to give him, he obtained by his personal influence, backed by the terror of an army of occupation. During his High Commissionership he made Great Britain the real master of the land and the Khedive with his ministers merely an ostensible ruler. Every branch of the administration was brought under his scrutiny and carried on according to his command. European advisers and secretaries were attached to every minister.

and a large number of Europeans were appointed to various posts. They became the real administrators of the country. This process—the wresting of power from the native rulers,—went on until the climax was reached on March 21, 1919, when General Allenby was appointed as a Special High Commissioner with unlimited powers both in civil and military affairs.

All this galled the Egyptians and so they wanted reform. But the reform which Lord Cromer and his successors suggested could not satisfy them. The whole Administration of Lord Cromer in Egypt suggested one thing—benevolent autocracy for Egypt and the benevolent autocrat should be the High Commissioner himself and not the Khedive. The Khedive was made a constitutional prince. There was a legislative assembly but with no voice in the administration. Great Britain's policy was to make that body effective and popular. Lord Kitchener's proposed organic law of 1913, very much like our Morley-Minto Scheme, was enacted for this purpose.

But British statesmen in Egypt failed to see the root cause of the dissatisfaction of the people, or ignored it altogether. Mere improvement of the financial position or the purging of the executive department of corruption which Lord Cro-

mer did effectively, could not satisfy the people. For this unrest was due to the dictates of human nature which abhors control by any one alien in race, in customs, and in religion.

This race prejudice and religion did much to shape the policy of the Nationalist party and to spread dissatisfaction in the country. They could understand the Khedive or even the Sultan whose suzerainty over Egypt did not clash with their nationalistic idea because they were accustomed to it for centuries and more-over he was their co-religionist, and their religious head. But what was the position of the British in their eye? They were foreigners who in the name of effecting reform in their country monopolised the sovereign power to themselves. This they could not tolerate, so they wanted to see the British to go out of their country. They were willing to show their gratitude for the past services which Great Britain rendered to their country, but could not give up their independence for it.

Al Azhar University, a great stronghold of orthodox Mahamedanism and the lettered young men who greatly imbibed the European culture helped to build up the Nationalist party. The party was greatly strengthened by Kamil Pasha who inaugurated the Pan-Islamic Movement in Egypt.

in 1905. Their idea was to found a grand Islamic federation in the world, Independent Egypt was not their motto.

But this has brought a revolution in Egypt—revolution in the status of Egypt and a revolution in the programme of the nationalist party, Egypt was no longer a parcel of the Ottoman Empire, not even in theory. What should be the exact nature of the status of Egypt? That was the problem to be solved.

After the Declaration of December 1919, Great Britain announced no clear-cut policy regarding Egypt. But from the attitude of the Anglo-Egyptian Government it seemed that only a large measure of autonomy was in store for Egypt. For that purpose they formulated a secret scheme during the war. It was proposed to divide the Legislative Assembly into Upper and Lower Houses, giving the Upper House supreme power in legislation. The Upper House was proposed to be composed partly of elected members and partly of members nominated by the Egyptian and British Governments and by foreigners, nominated members forming the majority.

But such a scheme could not commend itself to the Egyptians. Egypt never ceased to enjoy a large measure of autonomy. She had her Khedive,

her ministers and also an army, she could ever send her representatives to international conferences, though with no right of voting. What the majority of the people wanted was removal of tutelage and a responsible Self Government under the protection of Great Britain.

But the Nationalist Party advocated complete independence. Their leader was Zaghlul Pasha. He was described as a typical Fellah product of Al Azhar. In Lord Cromer's time he was Minister of Education and won his special approbation. At that time he substituted Arabic for English as the medium of instruction even in scientific subjects. Later on, he came to be Minister of Justice, but under pressure from Lord Kitchener for his nationalist ideas he was forced to resign in 1913. He was returned as a member to the Legislative assembly and became its Vice-President. Just two days after the armistice had been signed in November 1918, he demanded of Sir Reginald Wingate, the then High Commissioner on behalf of the nation, evacuation of Egypt and also asked permission to proceed to London to lay the case of Egypt before the British public. But his credentials had been challenged and so he was not allowed to sail. At once Zaghlul Pasha set about to secure the necessary credentials from the nation.

A few days after this incident Rushdi Pasha who was Prime Minister during the war and a Moderate in his views, suggested that he and one of his colleagues should visit London to discuss with the Cabinet the future policy in Egypt. He also asked that the Nationalist leaders might accompany him with the same object. But his suggestion was not heeded at that time on the plea that the Cabinet was too busy otherwise. This refusal brought a crisis in Egypt. Passion ran high and everybody became suspicious regarding the intention of Great Britain. The Nationalist party swept everything before them and there remained only one party—the Egyptian Nation. Rushdi Pasha resigned his post and openly declared his sympathy with Zaghlul Pasha.

Zaghlul Pasha at once changed his programme. He gave up his intention of going to London; challenged the existence of British Protectorate in Egypt, and made every preparation to go to Paris, "to plead the cause of Egypt in the Peace Conference." Great was the enthusiasm he created in the country and his house became the centre of the Nationalist movement.

Then followed a series of repressions and retaliations. Martial law was declared; the Legislative Assembly was prorogued; and lastly Zaghlul Pasha

Government at last expressed its readiness to receive an Egyptian Delegation and announced on September 23 1919, a Mission under the Chairmanship of Lord Milner "for the purpose of investigating and reporting on the steps to be taken to introduce a measure of local Government" Two months after this announcement Lord Allenby, the then High Commissioner, made the long needed Declaration regarding the future policy in Egypt. He promised in general terms autonomy and a wide measure of self government.

But this came too late. The Egyptians were no longer to be put off with generalities. In spite of the recognition of the British protectorate over Egypt the nation as a body challenged it and determined not to be satisfied until complete independence be obtained. So they proposed to boycott the Milner Mission.

In the meantime Zaghlul Pasha began his work in Paris. He tried to make the powers interested in the cause of Egypt. He suspected that the British intended to annex Egypt. So from the beginning he avoided meeting with the British alone. By his attempt to secure an Egyptian representation in the Peace Conference he wished to make the Egyptian question an international one. Most probably with this in view he even supported

capitulation, whereby the powers 17 in number at the time of war enjoyed a sort of sovereignty over Egypt in matters of legislation and taxation. But though the peace conference could not take up his cause yet his effort did not prove altogether fruitless.

The Milner Mission started for Egypt in the beginning of this year and after a stay there for 3 months, it returned to England. In spite of its general boycott by the Egyptians, it gathered valuable evidence regarding the financial condition of Egypt. However, the Milner Mission saw the necessity of satisfying the nationalists in Egypt; so at last it came to terms with Zaghlul's party and recent telegram of 25th August stated that a compromise had been reached.

Milner-Zaghlul Pact.

The following is the text of the Memorandum which is the result of conversation held in London in June to August last between the Milner Mission and Zaghlul Pasha and his colleagues.—

1.—In order to establish the independence of Egypt on a secure and lasting basis, it is necessary that the relations between Great Britain and Egypt should be precisely defined and the privileges and immunities now enjoyed in Egypt by the capitulatory powers should be modified and rendered less injurious to the interests of the country.

4—This Treaty 'will embody stipulations to the following effect :—

(1) Egypt¹ will enjoy the right of representation in foreign countries. In the absence of any duly accredited Egyptian representative, the Egyptian Government will confide its interests to the care of the British representative. Egypt will undertake not to adopt in foreign countries an attitude which is inconsistent with the alliance, or will create difficulties for Great Britain, and will also undertake not to enter into any agreement with a foreign power which is prejudicial to British interests.

(11) Egypt will confer on Great Britain the right to maintain a military force on Egyptian soil for the protection of her Imperial communications. The Treaty will fix the place where the force shall be quartered, and will regulate any subsidiary matters which require to be arranged. The presence of this force shall not constitute in any manner a military occupation of the country or prejudice the rights of the Government of Egypt.

(11) Egypt will appoint, in concurrence with His Majesty's Government, a Financial Adviser, to whom shall be entrusted in due course the powers at present exercised by the Commissioners of

2.—The ends cannot be achieved without further negotiation between accredited representatives of the British and Egyptian Governments respectively in the one case, and between the British Government and the Governments of the capitulatory powers in the other case. Such negotiations will be directed to arriving at definite agreement on the following lines :—

3.—(I) As between Egypt and Great Britain a Treaty will be entered into, under which Great Britain will recognise the independence of Egypt as a constitutional monarchy, with representative institutions, and Egypt will confer upon Great Britain such rights as are necessary to safeguard her special interests, and to enable her to furnish the guarantee which must be given in to Foreign Powers to secure the relinquishment of their capitulatory rights.

(II) By the same Treaty, an Alliance will be concluded between Great Britain and Egypt, by which Great Britain will undertake to support Egypt in defending the integrity of her territory, and Egypt will undertake, in case of war, even when the integrity of Egypt is not affected, to render to Great Britain all the assistance in her power within her own borders, including the use of her harbours, aerodromes, and means of communication for military purposes.

4—This Treaty will embody stipulations to the following effect :—

(1) Egypt will enjoy the right of representation in foreign countries. In the absence of any duly accredited Egyptian representative, the Egyptian Government will confide its interests to the care of the British representative. Egypt will undertake not to adopt in foreign countries an attitude which is inconsistent with the alliance, or will create difficulties for Great Britain, and will also undertake not to enter into any agreement with a foreign power which is prejudicial to British interests.

(11) Egypt will confer on Great Britain the right to maintain a military force on Egyptian soil for the protection of her Imperial communications. The Treaty will fix the place where the force shall be quartered, and will regulate any subsidiary matters which require to be arranged. The presence of this force shall not constitute in any manner a military occupation of the country or prejudice the rights of the Government of Egypt.

(11) Egypt will appoint, in concurrence with His Majesty's Government, a Financial Adviser, to whom shall be entrusted in due course the powers at present exercised by the Commissioners of

the Debt and who will be at the disposal of the Egyptian Government for all other matters on which they may desire to consult him

(iv) Egypt will appoint in concurrence with His Majesty's Government, an official in the Ministry of Justice who shall enjoy the right of access to the Minister. He shall be kept fully informed of all matters connected with the administration of the law as affecting foreigners and will also be at the disposal of the Egyptian Government for consultation on any matter connected with the efficient maintenance of law and order

(v) In view of the contemplated transfer, to his Majesty's Government of the rights hitherto exercised under the regime of the Capitulations by the various foreign Governments Egypt recognizes the right of Great Britain to intervene, through her representative in Egypt to prevent the application to foreigners of any Egyptian law now requiring foreign consent and Great Britain on her side undertakes not to exercise this right except in the case of laws operating inequitably against foreigners

ALTERNATIVE

In view of the contemplated transfer, to His Majesty's Government of the right hitherto exerci

sed under the regime of the Capitulations by the various foreign Governments, Egypt recognizes the right of Great Britain to intervene through her representative in Egypt to prevent the application to foreigners of any law now requiring foreign consent, and Great Britain on her side undertakes not to exercise this right except in the case of laws inequitably discriminating against foreigners in the matter of taxation inconsistent with the principles of legislation common to all the Capitulatory Powers.

(VI) On account of the special relation between Great Britain and Egypt created by the Alliance the British representative will be accorded an exceptional position in Egypt and will be entitled to precedence over all other representatives.

(VII) The engagements of British and other foreign officers and administrative officials who entered into the service of the Egyptian Government before the coming into force of the Treaty, may be terminated at the instance of either the officials themselves or the Egyptian Governments, at any time within two years after the coming into force of the Treaty. The pension or compensation to be accorded to officials retiring under this provision, in addition to that provided by the exist-

ing law, shall be determined by the Treaty. In cases where no advantage is taken of this arrangement, existing terms of service will remain unaffected.

5 This Treaty will be submitted for approval to a Constituent Assembly but it will not come into force until after the agreements with foreign powers for the closing of their Consular Courts and the decrees for the reorganization of the Mixed Tribunals have come into operation.

6 This Constituent Assembly will also be charged with the duty of framing a new organic statute, in accordance with the provisions of which the Government of Egypt will in future be conducted. This Statute will embody provisions for the Ministers being responsible to the Legislature. It will also provide for religious toleration for all persons and for the due rites of the foreigners

7. The necessary modifications in the regime of the Capitulations will be secured by agreements to be concluded by Great Britain with the various Capitulatory Powers. These agreements will provide for the closing of the foreign Consular Courts so as to render possible the reorganization and extension of the jurisdiction of the Mixed Tribunals and the application to all foreigners in Egypt of

the legislation (including legislation imposing taxation) enacted by the Egyptian Legislature.

8. These 'agreements will provide' for the transfer to His Majesty's Government of the rights previously exercised under the regime of the Capitulations by the various foreign Governments. They will also contain stipulations to the following effect—

(a) No attempt will be made to discriminate against the nationals of a Power which agrees to close its Consular Courts, and such nationals shall enjoy in Egypt the same treatment as British subjects.

(b) The Egyptian Nationality Law will be founded on the *jus sanguinis*, so that the children born in Egypt of a foreigner will enjoy the nationality of their father and will not be claimed as Egyptian subjects.

(c) Consular officers of the foreign Powers shall be accorded by Egypt the same status as foreign Consuls enjoy in England.

(d) Existing Treaties and Conventions to which Egypt is a party on matters of commerce and navigation, including postal and telegraphic Conventions, will remain in force, pending the conclusion of special agreements to which she is

a party. Egypt will apply the Treaties in force between Great Britain and the foreign Powers concerned on questions affected by the closing of the Consular Courts, such as extradition Treaties, Treaties for the surrender of seamen, deserters, etc, as also Treaties of political nature, whether multi-lateral, bilateral e. g., Arbitration, Conventions and the various Conventions relating to the conduct of hostilities.

(e) The liberty to maintain schools and to teach language of the foreign country concerned will be guaranteed, provided that such schools are subject in all respects to the laws applicable generally to European schools in Egypt.

(f) The liberty to maintain or organize religious and charitable foundation, such as hospital, etc, will also be guaranteed.

(g) The Treaties will also provide for the necessary changes in the Commission of the Debt and the elimination of the international element in the Alexandria Board of Health.

9. The legislation rendered necessary by the aforesaid agreements between Great Britain and the foreign powers, will be enacted by decrees to be issued by the Egyptian Government.

A decree shall be enacted at the same time, validating all measures, legislative, administrative, or judicial, taken under Matial Law.

10. The decrees for the re-organization of the Mixed Tribunals will provide for conferring upon these Tribunals all jurisdiction hitherto exercised by the foreign Consular Courts, while leaving the Jurisdiction of the Native Courts, untouched.

11. After the coming into force of the Treaty referred to in Article 8, Great Britain will communicate its terms to foreign powers and will support an application of Egypt, for admission as a member of the League of Nations.

These are concessions no doubt. But there are points in the telegram which can easily lead one to suspicion. Every body acquainted with the Egyptian history knows full well that Egypt suffered not so much from any legal restrictions put upon her liberty as from the working out of those restrictions. The actions of the British Govt. in Egypt from Cromer downward will bear out that. So the value of these concessions depends upon the spirit in which Great Britain intends to look at them in the future.

EGYPT'S MARCH TOWARDS LIBERTY.

(MR V. J PATIL)

Egypt was conquered by the Turks in the 16th century. In the early part of the 19th century, Mahommed Ali founded the present dynasty. He acknowledged himself to be a Turkish vassal, but for the forty years preceeding 1880 Egypt was practically independent. In 1879 the relations between Egypt and her suzerain were established on this basis, the Khedive promised to pay Turkey an annual tribute, to limit his military expenditure during peace, and to observe any treaties with Governments that Turkey might sign. "Otherwise the Khedive was absolute and, in addition to Egypt, his rule was recognised as extending over the ill-defined territory of the Soudan."

During the first half of the nineteenth century Europeans went to Egypt in large numbers for commercial purposes. The wasteful expenditure and heavy borrowing of the Khedive Ismail placed Egypt in the hands of her foreign creditors and led to dual control by France and England, and, finally, to the deposition of Ismail through joint action by all the European powers.

Nationalist Movement.

The modern Nationalist movement began at the time that the power of the British and French financiers and the Governments which supported them became a real menace, but found its first expression in opposition to the Turkish suzerainty. It protested particularly against the employment of Turkish officers. Its leader, Arabi, however, soon turned its attention to wider issues, and in 1881 he effected a *coup d'état* and compelled the new Khedive both to concede a new constitution and to support a movement for the liberation of Egypt from foreign control, financially and politically.

The following year, Khedive, fearing the popularity of Arabi (who had become Minister of War) sought protection from the British and French. His action was immediately challenged in Alexandria, where there was a serious anti-foreign riot. The British Government responded by bombarding Alexandria and landing troops which destroyed Arabi's army. Arabi was exiled and the movement was temporarily suppressed.

Thus did the British Government crush by force of arms, the first organised attempt of the Egyptian people to gain political liberty. Had the legitimate and praiseworthy aspiration of the Egyptians been encouraged at this

instead of repressed, "constitutional" freedom might have been achieved without all the conflict and violence which have followed.

It was a liberal Government under Mr. Gpalstone which was responsible for this policy but an effort was made to make "intervention" consistent with Liberal (?) principles by a declaration that there was no intention of establishing a British Protectorate. In a despatch addressed to the Powers on January 5, 1883, Lord Granville, Foreign Secretary, stated that the British Government was desirous of withdrawing the army "as soon as the state of the country and organisation of proper means for the maintenance of the Khedive's authority will admit of it." In the meantime, the British Government would "advise" the Khedive.

Despite this promise periodically repeated, the British army has remained in Egypt ever since.

A Beneficent Despot.

It is unnecessary to give in detail the story of the British occupation of Egypt, but mention must be made of Lord Cromer's term of office. Verbally, he expressed sympathy with Egyptian Nationalism, but his conception of the status of

the Egyptian people never passed beyond the point of a subservient participation in the British administration. He was an able and generally beneficent despot. He made Egypt solvent, encouraged irrigation, and (nominally) abolished the use of the lash and forced labour, but he flooded Egypt with British officials and made it clear to the more far-seeing Egyptians that it was hopeless to expect to win self-government through progressive advances to power *within* the British administration. How the administration became increasingly British rather than increasingly Egyptian is revealed by these figures. In 1896 the number of British employed in the services of the "Egyptian" Government was 266, in 1906 it was 662, and to-day it is 1,671.

Thus it came about that the Nationalist Party was gradually reformed and the agitation for self-government renewed. After Lord Cromer's retirement, the British Government so far yielded to protests as to allow a "Legislative Assembly" to be formed in 1913. Despite its name, the Assembly was given practically no legislative power. It could initiate proposals for legislation, but the Government could both decline to adopt the measures it carried and enact laws despite its opposition. Its only power over the ex-

ecutive was the restraint of any increase of direct taxation, and it was actually prohibited from even discussing such questions as the foreign relations of Egypt. The Assembly was composed of (i) the Ministers, (ii) 66 members chosen by elector-delegates, each of whom was chosen by 50 electors, and (iii) 17 members nominated by the Government to represent minorities.

The New Regime

Although its representative capacity was so qualified and its powers so slight, the Legislative Assembly gave the Egyptian people some opportunity of expressing their views and of criticising the Government, and for this reason came to be regarded by the Egyptians as symbol of their right to liberty. It only met once, however. On the outbreak of the Great War in 1914, the Assembly was suppressed. Egypt was proclaimed a British Protectorate, Martial Law was established, and a member of the house of Mahomed Ali was set up as "Sultan" in place of the ex-Khedive Abbas, who had remained loyal to Egypt's nominal Suzerain, the Turkish Sultan.

The British proclamation announcing the new regime was a moderately worded document and

only a few Egyptians appreciated how ominous it was. The mass of the people gave no heed to it and the educated minority regarded it as a temporary war measure. Rushdi Pash, the Prime Minister, was promised that, if the Egyptian people did not hinder British military activities during the war, self-government would be given when peace returned. A message was sent in the name of the British King promising that the British would recognise the integrity of Egypt when the war ended.

Egypt kept her side of this bargain, despite the provocatively oppressive British rule. A particularly severe and ridiculous censorship of letters, telegrams and, most important, of the press, was instituted and the Legislative Assembly was not permitted to meet. In direct denial of a pledge that the Egyptians should themselves not be involved in the war, one million Egyptians (one-thirteenth of the population) were enrolled under a system of virtual Conscription, and intolerable exactions of food, fodder, animals, etc, took place. Feeling against the British administration among the mass of the Egyptian people rose very high.

Repression in place of Liberty.

Bad as the situation became during the war,

however, it is probable that a fulfilment of the promise of Self-Government as soon as hostilities ceased would have renewed the confidence of the Egyptian people in Great Britain. But instead of liberty the Egyptians were given still sterner oppression. The operation of martial law was intensified, and the responsible Egyptian representatives were treated with contempt. The Prime Minister, Rushdi Pasha, tried to go to London to confer with the Foreign Office but the Foreign Office replied that it was too busy to think about Egypt. The Egyptian Ministry, thereupon resigned, and, since no one would take office in its place,* the country was left for nearly five months without legal government. The censorship prohibited the press from alluding to the crisis, but the news spread orally, with the result that a grave wave of anti-British feeling swept through the masses of the people.

* The British at length succeeded in getting Rushdi Pasha to reform a Ministry, but all the Egyptian civil servants thereupon "struck" and ten days later Rushdi was forced to resign. Mohamed Sudi then formed a Ministry, but only secured the co-operation of the Egyptian officials by declaring that he declined to assume any political responsibility, he was acting, he said, as an *administrative* head only. See later reference.

President Wilson's unqualified pronouncements in favour of self determination led the Egyptian people to concentrate their hopes upon the Peace Conference. To their amazement Egypt was refused presentation at the Conference although the newly created and less developed Kingdom of the Hedjaz was permitted an envoy. It would be difficult to exaggerate the feelings of bitterness and indignation which this decision aroused.

¹ At the beginning of this crisis a leader arose upon whom all the enthusiasm and hope of the Egyptian people has since concentrated. Saad Zaghloul Pasha was Minister of Education under Lord Cromer and is Chancellor of the Egyptian University at Cairo. He is a man of the highest repute and his ability, character and resolution have won the confidence of his people to an extraordinary degree. Rushdi Pash, the Prime Minister, having been denied access to the British Foreign office and the right to attend the Peace Conference, proceeded to take steps to organise a popular national delegation to Paris in the hope that the British Government might reconsider its decision or President Wilson insist upon its reception. He formed a Committee of Eighteen who prepared a petition for wide circulation to obtain

a mandate for the delegation. The British Government after a fortnight forbade the distribution of the petitions, but two million signatures were secured before this order could be made effective. Rushdi Pasha, although in a sense superseded by Zagloul, acknowledged the authority of the delegation.

Rebellion of March 1920

Having prevented the Egyptian people from demonstrating their support of the delegation in this way, the British Government proceeded to refuse passports to Zagloul and his three colleagues on the ground that they had no national mandate, and that the Legislative Assembly, of which Zagloul was vice-president, no longer existed. This decision was followed by the act which led to the "rebellion" of March, 1919,—the deportation of the four members of the delegation to Malta.

; Immediately Zagloul's internment was known, the people rose in spontaneous revolt. Communications were cut, the British were besieged in Assiout, and British officers were killed in a train south of Cairo. The native police were sent to quell the disturbances, but refused to act.

The important feature of this uprising was its all-inclusiveness. Practically every Egyptian sym-

pathised openly or secretly with it, and the Copts (Egyptian Christians) took a prominent part in it. Previously the Copts and Musulmans had been in constant conflict, but in this struggle their unity was such that the Copts were represented upon the Zagloul delegation.

It is necessary to record that the Egyptian Nationalists make grave allegations against the conduct of a section of the British army whilst engaged in repressing this revolt. They produce 16 affidavits, which allege the following, among other occurrences—

CAIRO.—Hundreds killed, wounded and imprisoned by British soldiers, who swept the streets with machine-guns, during a peaceful demonstration of protest against the deportation of the Egyptian leaders. A ten-year old girl was assaulted by several soldiers until she died.

CHOBAK—British soldiers pillaged town, killed 21, wounded 12, outraged women, buried 5 Egyptians to their waists and cut them to pieces, and burned 144 of the 200 houses.

EL CHABANAT—Detachment of British soldiers pillaged village, burned it, and left 4,000 persons without shelter.

AZIZIA and BEDRECHIEU—Soldiers searched both villages for arms and burned a number of houses.

CHOUBRA-EL-CHARIEH and KAFFER-EL-HAGGA.—Alleging that a shot had been fired at an English patrol, soldiers condemned all male inhabitants to be flogged on the stomach and back (photographs were produced).

UPPER EGYPT—British General decreed that every Egyptian, including high dignitaries, must salute British officers in the street. Those who did not obey the order were dragged before Courts Martial. The Nationalists demanded an inquiry into these serious charges, but the Government declined to take any action although the demand was supported by Labour members in the British House of Commons.

We have already seen an expression of the "Non-Co-operation", movement in the refusal of any Egyptians to form a Ministry following upon the resignation of Rushdi Pasha, the Prime Minister, when the British Foreign office declined to confer with him on the future of Egypt. During this uprising a determination to boycott the British administration developed widely. Many Egyptians holding official positions under the British

resigned. There were extensive strikes of Government employees, and workers employed in British and European concerns (e.g., the water and tram companies at Alexandria) combined a political protest with an economic. Since this time strikes have constantly occurred, and the students are almost permanently on strike. It has in consequence become necessary not only to maintain discipline in the schools by martial law, but to arrange and enforce every detail in the curriculum by the same means.

The revolt in Egypt was so serious that the British Government decided, after a few days, to release the members of the delegation and to allow them to proceed to Paris, where other colleagues from Egypt joined them. Before the delegates reached Paris, however, the British had secured from President Wilson a secret recognition of the British Protectorate over Egypt, and during the year they stayed in Paris the delegation failed to secure a hearing either from President Wilson or any other statesman of the Allied and Associated Governments.

The proposals of the Zaghloul delegation were complete independence under the guarantee of the League of Nations and the restoration of the

Soudan to Egypt. They promised to safeguard foreign interests by retaining the Capitulations, and they made no claim on Suez Canal.

What are Capitulations ?

(The Capitulations are agreements between European Governments and Turkey, giving Europeans special privileges which they can appeal to their respective Power to enforce, (a) They are exempt from the Jurisdiction of the Native Courts. In criminal cases they are tried by their own Courts or sent to their own country for trial. In civil cases they go before the Mixed Tribunals (established in 1876), composed of foreign and of native judges, the foreign element predominating. (b) They are immune from taxation excepting custom duty and land tax. (c) They have immunity of domicile. Note. A Committee is now sitting in secret to modify the law with a view to replacing the Capitulations, which are made obsolete by the termination of the Turkish Suzerainty.)

In May, 1919, Lord Curzon announced that a Mission under Lord Milner would be sent to Egypt to enquire into the causes of the rebellion and to prepare a Constitution under the British Protectorate. The announcement was received

in Egypt with derision, and during the nine months which elapsed before the Mission actually sailed, the Nationalist leaders succeeded in gaining the support of the people for a policy of boycott. The Mission spent three months in Egypt, employed every device to secure the co-operation of the Egyptian people, and it returned to England without a single representative Egyptian having consulted with it ! Never in history has a nation revealed more united determination

The intensity of feeling among the Egyptian people was revealed in many ways. The members of the Egyptian Bar struck work for a week in protest against the coming of the Mission. The cab drivers struck. The boys and girls in the schools struck. There was a remarkable three weeks strike of the Egyptian officials in all the public departments. The Ministry resigned (See previous footnote.)

No response to Milner mission.

For a time the Mission sat isolated at the Semiramis Hotel, surrounded by armoured cars and aeroplanes, sending forth invitations to appear before them to give evidence. In no case there was any response from a representative leader.

This extraordinarily successful boycott led Lord Milner to issue proclamation couched in most conciliatory terms. It is worth quoting as indicative of the influence of the boycott policy :—

“The British Government sent the Mission out with approval of the British Parliament to reconcile the Egyptian aspirations with Great Britain's special interests in Egypt, and with the maintenance of the legitimate rights of foreign residents. We are convinced that with goodwill on both sides this object can be obtained. It is the sincere desire of the Mission to see the relations between Great Britain and Egypt established on a basis of friendly accord, and to put an end to friction, thus enabling Egyptians to devote their whole energies to the development of the country under self governing institutions.

“In pursuance of this task the Mission desires to hear all the views of representatives of bodies or individuals having the welfare of the country at heart. All opinion may be freely expressed to the Mission. There is no wish to restrict the area of discussion, nor need any man fear that he will compromise his convictions by appearing before it. He will, on the contrary be no more compromised by expressing his opinions than the Mission

will be compromised by hearing them. Without a perfectly frank discussion it will be difficult to put an end to misunderstanding and arrive at an agreement."

Nationalists Firm.

Such a reasonably worded declaration might have been expected to shatter the determination of the people. It failed to do so. The Nationalists in their reply expressed appreciation of the intention to widen the field for discussion, but stated that they would only negotiate when their right to complete independence was recognised. The boycott continued unbroken.

A feature of the boycott was the part played by the students. They organised processions through the streets and held demonstrations. They assisted in the organisation of strikes and urged shopkeepers to close their shops. They picketed the Semiramis Hotel with a view to dissuading Egyptians from approaching the Mission, and reported any Egyptian who passed in. Sir Owen Thomas, a member of the the Mission, complains that they had no opportunity of learning the view of the *fellaheen*, 'Always a band of students..... motored in advance of any individual member of the Mission who attempted to get into touch or

direct communication with, the *fellaheen*, to warn them what to say, and what not to say."

The strikes among schoolboys and students became so frequent that the authorities had to issue an order stating that "schoolboys and students who do not at once join and abstain from turbulent political demonstrations and strikes, will not be allowed to go up for this winter's examinations.

Egyptian Women's part.

The Egyptian women threw themselves into the anti British movement with remarkable enthusiasm. The following passages are quoted from an article by Sir Valentine Chirol, a notoriously unsympathetic observer, in the "Times" (January 2, 1900) :

"In the stormy days of March and April last they descended in large bodies into the streets, those of the more respectable classes still veiled and shrouded in their loose blacks, the courtesans from the lowest quarters of the city, who had also caught the contagion, unveiled and arrayed in less discreet garments. In every turbulent demonstration women were well to the front. They marched in procession, some on foot, some in carriages, shouting for 'Independence' and 'Down with the English', and waving national banners. They

flocked to the houses of the Extremist leaders, and Mdme. Zagloul Pasha and others addressed impassioned orations to them from their windows.

"They followed in large crowds the coffins of the rioters killed in the street affrays, and rent the air with their shrill lamentations. They took in hand the building of barricades, and though they generally dispersed when fighting actually began, some of them, it was noted, returned to gloat over brutal deeds of violence perpetrated by the men.

"When the Government officials went on strike, small groups of women acted as pickets outside the gates of the Ministries to hold up those who wanted to return to their duties. In the *fellahs* rising the women, embittered perhaps by the hardships they suffered through ruthless requisition of war-supplies and the arbitrary recruitment for the labour corps in their villages by order of the British Government, as they were told, joined with the men in tearing up the railway lines and destroying the telegraphs, and in the pillaging and burning which took place up and down the countryside.

"Women have been equally prominent in all the noisy demonstrations of the last two months

against the Milner Mission, one of their favourite devices being to take possession of the tramway-cars at some terminus and drive through the city without, of course paying any fares, yelling 'Down with Milner' and other patriotic amenities, and flaunting little paper flags in the faces of any Europeans who venture to claim their right to travel in public conveyances

"What is more serious is that the infection has spread into the girls' school, and, like the boys' schools, they go on strike to mark their disapproval of Lord Milner and his colleagues, and children of 11 and 12 concoct passionate telegrams of protest to the Minister of Education, and even to the Prime Minister. Members of the Cabinet themselves complain bitterly that they cannot restrain their own daughters. The girls are indeed more violent than the boys. . . . It would be wrong to make light of the widespread bitterness that underlies this feminine upheaval. For the women of Egypt, though they may be politically powerless, reflect, perhaps in exaggerated, but none the less alarming form, the general uprising against authority produced by the Extremist campaign against the British usurpers."

The incidents described above were characteristic of the general revolt of the entire people ag-

body) met and unanimously declared Egypt an independent nation

Nationalists' Campaign in Europe and America.

One characteristic of the Egyptian Nationalists' campaign is worth noting the publicity they sought and secured in Europe, and particularly in America. In America they were most effectively represented and published an excellently produced White Book containing the documents addressed by the Zagloul delegation to President Wilson and other representatives of the Peace Conference, and also the evidence, referred above, of the harsh British suppression of the uprising. In the Press and in the Congress the Egyptian Nationalist cause was given prominent expression. The Egyptian Nationalists realised how deeply American public feeling reacts upon the British people and the British Government, and spent a large part of their energies in propaganda there. They sent Mohammed Pasha Mahnoud as a deputation to Washington.

What may well prove to be the last chapter in this 'story' is now being written. The Milner Commission returned to England in March having entirely failed to break the circle around them.

Arriving in London, they pocketed their pride and made a direct appeal to Zaghlul and his delegation, to Zaghlul, whom the British had denied passports as unrepresentative, to Zaghlul, whom they had interned and deported, to Zaghlul whom they had refused to see when finally he was permitted to go to Paris !

Absolute Independence.

The Zaghlul delegation is now negotiating with the Milner Commission. It still insists upon absolute independence for Egypt, but, that granted, it is prepared to consider Great Britain's special interests, the Milner Commission has been suppressed by the revelation of solidarity which it witnessed, that it is suggesting that the independence of Egypt should be recognised if the Egyptians in return agree to the retention of British control over the Suez Canal and the continued quartering in Egypt of British troops *

* The reader has already seen the Milner—Zaghlul Pact and a recent Reuter cabal informs us that Lord Allenby has announced the decision of the British Government withdrawing British Protectorate over Egypt as a guarantee of England's good intention for the final settlement of the Anglo-Egyptian Alliance

An Interview With Saad Pasha Zaghlul

Saad Pasha Zaghlul, tall and spare, has a simple dignity of bearing, a quiet charm of sympathy in the intelligent, searching eyes—a hint of humour in the mobile mouth and a suggestion of such latent force behind the somewhat delicate exterior which combines to produce a compelling but winning personality. If his face reveals the stress of his stormy political life of the past seven years, it also bears the imprint of the confidence and calm judgment of a statesman who, assured of the integrity of his cause, can await through storm, the time of its fulfilment.

Originally a member of the "moderate" party Saad Pasha Zaghlul won golden opinions from Lord Cromer and Abbas II, Khedive of Egypt. As Minister of education and later as Minister of Justice, he collaborated with the Coptic Prime Minister Boutros Pasha, Ghali, Fehmi Pasha, and Mohammed Saad Pasha, showing great independence and offering inveterate opposition to Turkish designs and intrigues with the inevitable result that he incurred the Khedive's displeasure. It will not be unfair to point that the "moderate" party was more or less a creation of Lord Cromer's, called into being to support the British occu-

pation, but nevertheless be it said to its credit that the party invited British co-operation with a view to redress Egyptian grievances and promote Egyptian interests in so far as this was consistent with the retention of the favour of the government.

Since 1910 the moderate party has ceased to exist, and since 1912 Saad Pasha Zaghlul has been the non-official Vice-President of the Legislative Assembly. Only last year monster petitions were signed and resolutions passed by representative bodies which included ruling princes, Government officials of all grades, *fallaheen* and women in their long list of signatories recognizing and appointing Zaghlul as sole mandatory of the Egyptian people. State officials in a body, moreover, fully supported the claims of the Nationalist party.

More than this, in the Legislative Assembly itself resolutions were passed affirming all laws which had been passed since the prorogation of the Assembly during the war to be null and void; declaring the sovereignty of Egypt over the Sudan and the indissoluble union of the two countries, affirming the national independence and sovereignty of Egypt and recognizing Saad Pasha Zaghlul as the sole mandatory of the Egyptian people.

Lord Allenby, who at first thought it impolitic to interfere with such unequivocal national sentiment, a few days later prohibited all notices of these proceedings from appearing in even the native press and made their repetition a serious offence against martial law

The Egyptian Nationalist Delegation under the Pasha's able leadership, conducted an extensive and intelligently organized propaganda in the interests of complete national independence for Egypt. I was interested to put some questions. We talked in French, my questions, I am afraid, were clumsy, but his replies answered my thought 'Do you think the independence of Egypt will ever be conceded by the British Government?'

The ex Minister of Education leant back meditatively "No doubt, Mr Balfour has declared in the House of Commons that British supremacy must be maintained in Egypt and Lord Curzon, though more conciliatory in tone and temper, has argued in the House of Lords that under British supervision and guidance representative institutions must be slowly evolved. But the unanimous verdict of the Egyptian people has already gone forth for complete independence, and reforms will never satisfy us until the Protectorate, which was wrong-

absolute and undivided authority over our own." The scheme of reforms which Sir William Brunyate drew up for us was a masterpiece of bureaucratic stupidity. The Upper Chamber was to have consisted of the henchmen of the British government and representatives of the foreign financial and commercial interests; the Legislative which has not even been once convened during the five years of war was to be given no control over the Budget or power to pass legislation. The scheme which Lord Allenby offered as emanating from the Home Government skilfully disguised the designs of British imperialism to tighten its grip over Egypt and to strangle the growing nationalist movement.

"But we are in no mood to be deceived by these political legerdemain, manœuvred so that Egypt might eternally remain the happy hunting ground for financial adventurers from every part of the globe.

"But might not the withdrawal of the British army of occupation strengthen the reactionaries in Egypt?"

"What reactionaries? Are we not—is not Egypt—absolutely one men—Copts and Muslims alike—in demanding the recognition of Egypt as a free, sovereign state?"

the material advancement of Egypt we hold that it has inflicted serious injuries in crippling our self-confidence and moral development. We are powerless to initiate urgent reforms or to redress the grievances of the people because we have no control over and no responsibility for the government of the country "

But suppose the negotiations fall short of complete independence would you be prepared to accept self-government within the Empire ?

Saad Pasha Zaghlul's whole body became rigid, implacable, his voice stern and passionate :

"Egypt never recognized the British Protectorate no international sanction was ever given to it : successive generation of British statesmen from Gladstone and Salisbury downwards have formally repudiated it : at best apologising for it as a temporary expedient to tide over an awkward emergency. No less a personage than your King guaranteed the independence of Egypt when the war should be victoriously concluded. We were never a dependency of the British Empire and we shall never accept 'self-government' or any other euphemious status within it. We want at least as much independence as Belgium and Poland. We do not ask for new territory,, but we claim

absolute and undivided authority over our own." The scheme of reforms which Sir William Brunyate drew up for us was a masterpiece of bureaucratic stupidity. The Upper Chamber was to have consisted of the henchmen of the British government and representatives of the foreign financial and commercial interests; the Legislative which has not even been once convened during the five years of war was to be given no control over the Budget or power to pass legislation. The scheme which Lord Allenby offered as emanating from the Home Government skilfully disguised the designs of British imperialism to tighten its grip over Egypt and to strangle the growing nationalist movement.

"But we are in no mood to be deceived by these political legerdemain, manœuvred so that Egypt might eternally remain the happy hunting ground for financial adventurers from every part of the globe.

'But might not the withdrawal of the British army of occupation strengthen the reactionaries in Egypt?'

"What reactionaries? Are we not—is not Egypt—absolutely one men—Copts and Muslims alike—in demanding the recognition of Egypt as a free, sovereign state?"

"Yes, but as a progressive modernist do you not fear revival of religious fanaticism and old-world corruption?"

The Pasha spread his hands half impatiently; "In our demand for freedom we are not Pan-Islamic. We do not ask for a theocratic republic as some seem to do in India. Our demand is for impersonal democratic rule whereby the Egyptian rulers of Egypt will be directly responsible to the elected representatives of the people in their capacity as constitutional sovereigns. We are not agitating for the revival of personal absolutism or the supremacy of Islam but for the unrestricted opportunity to raise the masses to higher standards and to place Egypt in the forefront of civilized nations. Do you really believe the little fairy tale that only the Western races are capable of progress? If you will pardon a personal reference Previous to my appointment as Minister of Education, I encouraged Egyptian girls to go to Europe to complete their education and come back to Egypt and teach in our schools and colleges. I have always fought for mass education for men and women for the revival of the vernacular and native classics as well as for the extension of Western learning and the adoption of the most up to date principles and methods of teaching."

" If it is not rude, may I ask what credentials the Deputation possesses to represent the whole of Egypt ?"

" The signatories to the manifesto on Egyptian Independence which I issued ran into thousands Hamid Pasha of Bassal, the Bedouin leader, presided over the historic gathering Lord Allenby was so much afraid of the unanimity of opinion that he interned some and restricted the movements of others My colleagues, Mahomed Pasha, Mamud Ismail Sidki Pasha, are great men wielding considerable influence over the Egyptians, the Rector and the governing body of the El-Azhar University have supported us; the ex-Prime Minister, Hussain Bushdi Pasha and the Minister of Justice, Adi Pasha are absolutely at one with us None but the military authorities challenge our credentials "

" Would the proposals made by Lord Milner and his colleagues be acceptable to the Egyptian people? "

" That I cannot tell We had a mandate to negotiate, with the responsible ministers of the Crown, but not to ratify and conclude a Treaty without first consulting our people. "

Egyptian Freedom and Indian Independence.

The most significant feature of recent political activities in Egypt has been the reinforcement of the demand for full political independence by an absolute unanimity among Moslems, and Copts, and the accession of strength to the Nationalist movement through the descent into the political arena of princes, peasants, State officials, and women. The cry for independence has not been raised by a section of the people, or by particular classes or groups. The students of the Al Azhar University have been at one with the Patriarchs of the Coptic Church, and ex-Cabinet Ministers like Rushdi Pasha have joined forces with progressive notables in demanding Egyptian freedom.

Unlike India, where the Government, by the creation of peerages and by offers of high preferment have for the moment succeeded in dividing the political parties, Egypt has been rigidly impervious to such inducements. Saad Pasha Zaghul's dictum that he would rather be the lowliest citizen of an independent Egypt than Prime Minister of the Protectorate which the people never recognized, reveals the temperament and disposition of the whole nation.

In this spirit the people formulated their demands, fortified by the assurances that came from the British Crown in 1845, when Turkish rule over Egypt was terminated, that "influences seeking to destroy the 'independence' and integrity of Egypt" will be countered and defeated. Turkish rule in Egypt was merely nominal and consisted in the payment of an annual tribute of £300,000 to the Sultan. But, with the formal repudiation of the Turkish connection the case for Egypt's political sovereignty was considerably strengthened. The Egyptians, and the enthusiasm of their political reawakening scattered to the winds the claims which the Caliph of Islam had on their spiritual allegiance. Egypt, and none other, had sovereign claim to their allegiance—minor loyalties were as dust in the balance.

A democratic spirit swept the country like a prairie fire. The British administration, vainly countered by the establishment of a rigid censorship, the conscription of labour, the suspension of the Legislative assemblies. The Nationalist leaders, Saad Pasha Zaghlul, Mahmud Pasha, Ismail Pasha Sidki, and others, applied for passports to lay the Egyptian case before the Versailles Conference. They were refused and deported to Malta. Tanks, armoured cars, and a flotilla of aeroplanes were

ion as a whole, specially boycotted the Commission, none were willing to give evidence before it or negotiate on any basis short of the recognition of the full independence of Egypt and the immediate abolition of the Protectorate. As Lord Milner's Commission had its terms of reference limited by the diplomatic and political exigencies of the Policy of the Home Government it returned to England.

The Egyptian Nationalist Delegation were invited to London to open negotiations with the British Government. They were adamant on the non-recognition of the British Protectorate and the demand for its abolition and independence compatible with guarantees for the safe guarding of European interests in Egypt so far as these did not infringe on fundamental national rights. Saad Pasha Zaghlul submitted a memorandum to Lord Milner's Commission, which was rejected as absolutely detrimental to the interests of the British Empire. The Commission in its turn drew up a scheme of Egyptian reforms which the Delegation categorically refused to discuss as being totally opposed to the interests and legitimate aims of Egyptians. Finally, a few weeks ago, a provisional arrangement was announced whereby the independence and sovereign

other veterans who have devoted their lives to the cause of Egyptian emancipation have given the terms their careful consideration and thought them worthy of dispassionate discussion. Nothing but good can result if the resources of a generous statesmanship on both sides are judiciously employed to bring about an amicable settlement on the solid foundation of an independent Egypt.

It is noteworthy that in such delicate matters involving the reconstruction of international relations, Lord Milner, the Tory imperialist has scored a significant victory over Mr. Montagu, the Liberal idealist. It is true that the British Cabinet in their declaration of Indian policy, stand committed to full self-government for India as an Integral unit of the British federation. But the British parliament has merely replaced the Bureaucracy in India as the self-constituted judge of the time and measure of each cautious advance towards the ultimate goal. The wishes and decisions of the Indian people are neither consulted nor considered. The Central Executive in the Government of India remains as autocratic as before ; a measure of control over Provincial Administration is given to the enlarged Provincial Councils with an elected majority in regard to "transferred" subjects while the permanent official of the Indian Civil Service